

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXIII

November • 1944

No. 1

*The Constitution
is a Political Document*

William C. Lucey

*American Diplomatic Opinion
On Italian Unification*

Joseph T. Durkin

*The "Anti-Jesuit Law"
of 1647
Edward L. Hirsch*

*The Monastic Corrody
Earl J. Kurth*

*Recent Books
in Review*

*Editorial:
The Historian and
Post War Planning*

25 cents a Copy

\$1.00 a Year

OUTLINE HISTORY SERIES

Ancient and Medieval History

(Third and revised edition)
by F. J. Aspenleiter, S.J., M.A.

AMERICAN HISTORY

by Martin F. Hastings, S.J., M.A.

MODERN HISTORY

by Eugene H. Korth, S.J.

General Editor

John Francis Bannon, S.J., Ph.D.

Published by —

The Historical Bulletin

Saint Louis University

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

20% discount on orders of fifteen or more

Price twenty-five cents

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR SUBSCRIBERS

Renewals:

One Year . . \$1.00

Two Years . . \$2.00

Three Years . . \$2.75

Four Years . . \$3.50

Five Years . . \$4.00

We appreciate your prompt renewal

*Please send all requests
directly to*

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Saint Louis University

Saint Louis, 3, Mo.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

ST. LOUIS 3, MISSOURI

Includes the following Schools and Colleges and Affiliated Institutions

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

College of Arts and Sciences	221 North Grand Blvd.
College of Arts and Sciences at Florissant	Florissant, Mo.
Graduate School	15 North Grand Blvd.
University College	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Divinity	St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas
School of Medicine	1402 South Grand Blvd.
School of Law	3642 Lindell Blvd.
School of Philosophy and Science	3633 West Pine
School of Dentistry	3556 Caroline Street
School of Commerce and Finance	3674 Lindell Blvd.
School of Nursing	1325 South Grand Blvd.
School of Social Work	207 North Grand Blvd.
Institute of Geophysical Science	3674 Lindell Blvd.
Institute of Geophysical Technology	3621 Olive St.
Labor School	3674 Lindell Blvd.
Physical Education	3672 W. Pine Blvd.
Gymnasium	3672 W. Pine Blvd.
Auditorium	3642 Lindell Blvd.
Radio Station W-E-W	3642 Lindell Blvd.
Walsh Memorial Stadium	5200 Oakland Blvd.

THE CORPORATE COLLEGES

Fontbonne College	Wydown and Big Bend Bvds.
Maryville College	Meramec and Nebraska Avenues
Webster College	Lockwood Blvd., Webster Groves, Missouri
Notre Dame Junior College	Ripa Avenue, South Saint Louis
Saint Mary's Junior College	O'Fallon, Missouri

THE HOSPITALS

1. UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS

(a) St. Mary's Hospital	6420 Clayton Rd.
(b) Firmin Desloge Hospital	1325 South Grand Blvd.
(c) Mt. St. Rose Sanatorium	9101 South Broadway

2. AFFILIATED HOSPITALS

(a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital	3933 South Broadway
(b) St. Anthony's Hospital	Grand Blvd. and Chippewa
(c) St. John's Hospital	307 South Euclid Avenue

3. STAFF-RELATED HOSPITALS

(a) St. Mary's Infirmary	1536 Papin Street
(b) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit I	1515 Lafayette Ave.
(c) Homer G. Phillips Hospital	2601 Whittier
(d) St. Louis City Sanitarium	5300 Arsenal Street
(e) St. Louis Isolation Hospital	5600 Arsenal Street

AFFILIATED NURSING SCHOOLS

(a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital School of Nursing	3933 South Broadway
(b) St. John's Hospital School of Nursing	307 S. Euclid Ave.

THE OUT-PATIENT SERVICES

1. THE UNIVERSITY OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENT

Firmin Desloge Hospital	1315 South Grand Boulevard
-------------------------	----------------------------

2. THE ASSOCIATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

(a) Alexian Brothers' Dispensary	3933 South Broadway
(b) St. John's Dispensary	4945 Audubon Avenue

THE STAFF-RELATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

(a) City Dispensary	1515 Lafayette Avenue
(b) The Obstetric Dispensaries	
St. Louis Obstetrical Hospital Association	
St. Ann's Foundling Asylum	
(c) The Pre-Natal Clinics	
The Cass Avenue Clinic	
The Bethesda Dispensary	

WHITE HOUSE

St. Louis House of Retreats—	
White House, Box 484, Route 9, Lemay P. O., Mo.	

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. Price: 25c a copy; \$1.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933

Vol. XXIII

NOVEMBER, 1944

No. 1

Table of Contents

THE CONSTITUTION IS A POLITICAL DOCUMENT	WILLIAM C. LUCEY	3
AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC OPINION ON ITALIAN UNIFICATION	JOSEPH T. DURKIN	5
EDITORIAL		7
THE "ANTI-JESUIT LAW" OF 1647	EDWARD L. HIRSH	9
THE MONASTIC CORRODY	EARL J. KURTH	11
RECENT BOOKS IN REVIEW		20

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the Catholic Magazine Index of *The Catholic Bookman* and *The Catholic Periodical Index*

The Constitution is a Political Document

William L. Lucey, S. J., Ph. D.

Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts

IT IS surprising how many people refer to the Constitution of the United States as an "economic" document. The reference is frequently made without much deliberation, for the idea, no doubt, has been borrowed from one of the too many American history textbooks which give their readers the impression that the Constitution was foisted on the public by a combination of professional money lenders, speculators and property men for their own immediate financial interests.

One particular study of the Constitution—*An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* by Charles A. Beard—has had considerable influence on the authors of high school and college textbooks. The author, of course, had no intention of proving that the members of the Federal Convention had such sordid motives. His studies were directed by the interesting query: Was the Constitution a document drafted by a group of men guided by the interests of their own economic class or by "abstract" principles of political science?¹ Unfortunately, the assumption was that these two motives were mutually exclusive and that there could be no alternative between the "abstract" principles of political science and the economic motives. So the evidence accumulated compelled him to decide quite emphatically in favor of the economic motive, while the method and the conclusions of the study are slanted in favor of economic determinism.

Teachers of American history, with only a few hours to direct their students in a study of the origins of the

Constitution, would welcome a chapter that presented in the proper proportion the influence of all the forces and factors which combined to frame the fundamental law of the land. There are signs that the historians are preparing the chapter. Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier theory is under attack,² and an agreement on its proper place in the interpretation of American history will soon be reached. The contention that the Constitution was merely an "economic" or a "class" document is a child of the same school. Some years ago, Professor Beard reminded his readers that any interpretation of an historical movement that ignored the political and cultural heritage of a people must of necessity be superficial. More recently in his delightful volume *The Republic* he disagrees with those who believe that economic practices and relations determine all political relations and sentiments.³ Yet the influence of his earlier conclusions was unmistakable and still endures.⁴

Economic Doctrine

The Constitution was to a certain degree an economic document. It would have been beyond explanation if it were not; it would also have been a dismal failure. No

² George Wilson Pierson, "The Frontier and American Institutions: A Criticism of the Turner Theory," *The New England Quarterly*, XV (June, 1942), 224-255.

³ Charles A. Beard and Mary A. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), I, 124; Charles A. Beard, *The Republic* (New York: The Viking Press, 1943), p. 316.

⁴ A fair example will be found in Homer C. Hockett, *Political and Social Growth of the American People 1492-1865* (3rd ed., New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940), pp. 280-297. Beard's thesis is given in the text itself, while in a footnote (p. 283) the author voices some dissent on the score that the Constitution was, in his opinion, the partial product of the political philosophy of the framers.

¹ Charles A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), pp. 16-17; 73. This is a reprint of 1913 edition.

political constitution, no frame of government, can ignore the economic activity of the community. This was especially true of the Constitution of the United States. Economic conditions helped to spawn the disturbing forces which, in turn, inspired the move to alter the Articles of Confederation. Plans for the convention were made when the "Commercial Convention" of Annapolis proved a failure. Congress was bankrupt, was without power to raise revenue, and her credit abroad destroyed. Lack of political power to control foreign and interstate commerce was admittedly a major cause of the disorderly conditions. The control of affairs was clearly beyond the competence of Congress. Sane and sensible men were agreeing that "a strong government ably administered" was needed to keep the states together. George Washington was convinced that the states would not long exist "as a nation without having lodged somewhere a power, which will pervade the whole Union in as energetic a manner as the authority of the State governments extends over the several States."⁵

The delegates, then, were sent to find a remedy for conditions sired, in part, by economic factors; it would have been strange if they had offered to the states a constitution that ignored them. To that extent the Constitution might be called an economic document, but, of course, that is not what the school of economic interpretation means when it uses that phrase.⁶

However, this response to economic conditions does not explain why a *federal republic of limited powers* was drafted at Philadelphia. Nor does the presence of speculators among the members give us the answer. The same frame of government would have been proposed, debated, drafted, bitterly opposed and eventually drafted by the states even though these gentlemen with the securities were absent. The federal government would have been strengthened, control over commerce granted Congress, public credit restored and the financial obligations contracted under the Articles respected in any plan proposed by the convention. The members were in agreement on these features from the desire and determination to construct a government that would endure. One did not have to be a speculator to advocate these measures, although the economic motive may have strengthened some of the members in their desire for a strong government. This may have been the decisive motive with some members.

Perhaps the speculators felt more secure when these articles were accepted, but if so, then their sense of security must have derived from some fancy crystal gazing. Who assured them that Washington (they could be quite certain that Washington would be the first President, if the Constitution was ratified) would appoint Hamilton Secretary of the Treasury, that Hamilton would succeed in funding the national debt at par, that the assumption of state debts would pass only with

the aid of a deal with Jefferson, that John Jay would refuse a re-appointment and thereby permit John Marshall to be the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court? Indeed, these speculators were not only financial wizards but marvelous clairvoyants, for without this series of fortunate events financial and property rights would not have prospered as they did under the national government.

We are apt to forget that the Constitution is much more than some articles that provide for the collection of taxes, for the regulation of commerce, for the control of the national credit and for the other concerns of the economic life of our nation. It is the fundamental law of the land; it is the fundamental law of a federal republic of limited powers. This is the important thing about the Constitution, and everyone, today above all, should know and understand why a federal republic of limited powers was drafted by the members of the Philadelphia Convention.

Philosophy of the Constitution

This federal republic of limited powers was a product of a school of political philosophy. It was not a school of abstract "forces," but an inheritance of sound, practical, concrete political ideas (that man has, for instance, certain rights prior to and beyond the government and beyond the will of the majority) based on a sane understanding of man and enriched by the lessons of experience. The Constitution was not a radical departure from the state constitutions, nor were the state constitutions, drafted during the Revolution, a radical departure from the colonial charters. Rhode Island and Connecticut were content to retain their charters, granted by Charles II, as state constitutions. There is a continuity of political ideas in all three frames of governments, and there are also contributions from man living amidst the abundance of land in the free air of the New World.

The framers of the Constitution inherited English political ideas and they were immediately influenced by what was called the Whig School. Not all, particularly the deeper political students among the framers and their contemporaries, were emphasizing the same ingredients in this political tradition. Some, under the leadership of James Madison and James Wilson, were more impressed with the pre-Lockean political ideas,—the legacy of the schoolmen.⁷ These two men together almost framed the accepted Constitution. But here we are more concerned with those who had not drunk so deeply of this political stream that flowed through our colonial and revolutionary and constitutional periods.

The citizens of this new nation were property-minded. There was no great difference between the framers and the farmers. Nor did the political views of the framers, the more conservative group in 1786, differ radically from those of the Revolutionary leaders. It was this radical group, it is well to remember, those who had

(Please turn to page fifteen)

⁵ S. E. Morison (ed.), *Sources and Documents Illustrating the American Revolution 1765-1788 and the Formation of the Federal Constitution* (London: Oxford University Press, 1923), p. 216, letter to John Jay, August 1, 1786.

⁶ It would be helpful if the student selected the sections of the Constitution that are of economic content. However, he will find these economic sections in Felix Flugel and Harold U. Faulkner, *Readings in the Economic and Social History of the United States* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1929), pp. 37-38.

⁷ The influence of the schoolmen on the framers is a field awaiting complete investigation. The following references will give the direction the study is taking. Gaillard Hunt, "Virginia Declaration of Rights and Cardinal Bellarmine," *The Catholic Historical Review*, III (October, 1917), 276-89; M. F. X. Millar, "Bellarmine and the American Constitution," *Studies*, XIX (September, 1930), 361-75; Wm. F. Obering, *The Philosophy of Law of James Wilson* (Washington, n.d.).

American Diplomatic Opinion on Italian Unification

Joseph T. Durkin, S. J., Ph. D.

Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

THE process of Italy's transformation from a geographical expression to a unified kingdom was watched by American diplomats at the scene of the events. From Turin, Naples, Rome, Vienna, Paris, and other focal points, the Ministers of the Republic of the New World observed with interest and sympathy this latest effort to extend to Europe the benefits of liberal political rule.

It was to be expected that they would be sympathetic witnesses, and, in the main, they were such. Even fiery liberals like Lord John Russell might wonder uncomfortably whether this New Italy was perhaps a bit too brash for Europe; but the Jacksonian Democrats and Yankee Republicans of the American ministerial residences would surely approve the Risorgimento as a crusade like that which had made their own nation!

However, in praising the Italian movement, they added some important and rather surprising reservations; and it is this which lends to their testimony a special significance. Further, their despatches contain some extremely interesting implications, the full import of which they themselves probably did not perceive.

These reservations and implications throw new light on the story of the unification of Italy, for the American ministers do not always support the traditional formulae of the liberal historians. Their testimony, indeed, in several important aspects, rather flies in the face of the traditional liberal view.

Below are presented some extracts from the official despatches (to the State Department) of one of these American ministers, John M. Daniel, stationed at Turin during the critical period 1859-1860.¹ He was a Jew, born in Virginia, and a man of advanced democratic sympathies. He was certainly predisposed in favor of the Italian liberals, and certainly not predisposed in favor of the papal or conservative parties. For these reasons his observations are all the more significant as he watches the birth-pangs of the Italian Kingdom, under the ministering care of Cavour, Garibaldi, and the ever-ready troops of Piedmont.

The Minister's Story Behind the Fact

By the end of March, 1860, most of northern and central Italy had been forcibly incorporated into Piedmont, and by the end of the year the kingdom of the Two Sicilies had been made a mere province of the New Italy. The first attack on the temporal possessions of the Pope had thus been successfully achieved, and the Piedmontese party claimed that independence and constitutional freedom had at last been won for Italy. Victor Emmanuel was now monarch of a 'liberal' state which extended from the Alps to the tip of the Italian boot.

What was the opinion of the American minister as he

witnessed these momentous events? In particular, what was his opinion as to the practicability of a single government for the peninsula?

Here, as so often elsewhere, his views are somewhat fluctuating. In the mid-summer of 1859 he believes that the political unification of Italy is an extremely unwise project. A new state formed on such lines would be the creature of France, with all the attendant evils.² But the chief obstacle lies in the sectional incompatibilities of the Italians.³

His confidence, too, in the distinterestedness of Piedmont, seems to have been rather weak. At least during his earlier years at Turin, he had viewed the efforts of Cavour in the national cause rather as a species of Piedmontese imperialism,⁴ and as late as February, 1860, the American minister has not changed his opinion.⁵

But, as the events of 1860 go forward, he appears to be

² *Sardinia*, Vol. VI, Daniel, No. 111, June 20, 1859. Note, however, Daniel's tribute to the 'popular' character of the revolt in the Legations in June of 1859: "No sooner had the Austrian troops left Ancona, Bologna, and Ferrara, than the people drove away the Papal authorities, formed a provisional government, and offered, as usual, the supreme authority to Victor Emmanuel" (*ibid.*). A similar view had been taken by E. J. Morris in regard to Rome, as far back as 1850: "My own observation while in Rome was sufficient to convince me that a deep-seated hostility exists among the influential classes of society to a further continuance of the exercise of temporal power by ecclesiastics, and that some modification of the existing order of things is necessary for the preservation of peace" (*Naples*, Vol. II, Morris, No. 1, Apr. 5, 1850). It is to be noted that Morris speaks of this opposition as coming from the "influential classes of society;" he does not say that it comes from the people, as a whole.

³ "The elements of discord and jealousy are so irradicable in the Italian nature, and the country itself is so little adapted to centralization, that no unitary government in the peninsula can stand without foreign assistance" (*Sardinia*, Vol. VI, Daniel, No. 111, June 20, 1859). A few years previously he had elaborated this thought of the natural disunity of Italy: "A great drawback to this country is the difference of population and language between the sections which compose it. The people of Savoy speak French; the people of Novara and Casale speak Lombard; the people of Piedmont speak Piedmontese; in Genoa and the Riviera, Genoese. In the island of Sardinia there are several patois. All of these dialects are completely distinct. A Genoese cannot understand a Piedmontese; an inhabitant of one parish in the island of Sardinia cannot understand the speech of a neighbor. Italian is the official dialect of the country, but it is nowhere the vernacular, and can be comprehended only by those who have a certain amount of education" (*Sardinia*, Vol. VI, Daniel, n.n., Jan. n.d., 1856).

⁴ "It is not . . . by railroads or by commercial enterprise that Sardinia hopes to become a great nation . . . It can become great only by politics and arms, by wars and annexation. With the addition of Lombardy, with Genoa and Venice, protected by the Alps and commanding the two seas, it would enter on a large career. This is the bright vision which has dazzled Sardinian eyes for many hundred years" (*Sardinia*, Vol. VI, Daniel, n.n., Jan. 1, 1856).

⁵ He scouts Cavour's assertion that Piedmont has hitherto confined her efforts to moral suasion, and that she has sought merely to induce the governments and populations of central Italy to "await the judgment of Europe" (*Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 134, Feb. 7, 1860).

⁶ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 151, June 12, 1860.

⁷ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, n.n., Feb. 14, 1860. Nine months later he writes: "This is not a temporary disturbance created by statesmen and soldiers, but one of those great tides in the affairs

¹ These unpublished documents are in The National Archives, Washington, D. C. In this article they will be identified according to title of volume as in the National Archives, name of minister, number of the despatch, and date of origin of the despatch.

in favor of the general idea of unification. He thinks that the movement is spontaneous and popular,⁶ and he declares, in regard to Central Italy, that annexation to Piedmont is the wish of nine out of every ten of the inhabitants,⁷ although, as we shall see, he was later forced to modify this last opinion.⁸ Yet throughout the 1859-1860 period, Daniel offers some strong adverse criticism of the movement, and that criticism is based largely on moral and legal grounds.

As regards the Piedmontese attack on the Papal Legations beginning in the spring of 1859, the American minister is scandalized at the violation of the Pontiff's legal rights. Pius IX, he points out, has not abdicated by flight; therefore, what proceeds in the Legations is mere civil war between an acknowledged and actual sovereign and several revolted provinces. There is no just cause for interference in such cases, or, if there is any cause for interference, it will be necessarily on the side of the papal government. The Pope, thinks Daniel, has the whole Catholic world with him.⁹ Victor Emmanuel himself, in speaking of Italian unification, has always admitted the Pope's sovereignty over the Legations. The same view has been held by Napoleon and by liberal statesmen throughout the world.¹⁰

As to the annexations and plebiscites in Central Italy in March, 1860, Daniel makes some acute observations. Earlier, in February, 1859, he had been convinced that the unification of that part of the peninsula was approved by European public opinion, that there was a strong presumption in favor of the proposed annexations, and that the Central Italians sincerely wished to be united to Piedmont.¹¹

Another Opinion

But, as he watches the process of making the new kingdom, the American minister gradually undergoes a change of view. In March, 1860, the very month of the final plebiscites, he expresses the rather startling opinion that the Tuscan people do not wish annexation to Piedmont, as a price of an united Italy.¹² Hitherto, he

of nations which change the political configuration of the world. It is not the work of individuals, but the general sentiment and unanimous wish of nearly all Italy" (*Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 176, Nov. 13, 1860). *Vide* also his observation of August of the same year: "The Sardinian government will not have the power to arrest this popular sentiment for unification with Piedmont. It would be destroyed if it attempted to do so. Even should all Europe menace this country, its government would be forced to turn a deaf ear to diplomacy and obey an irresistible popular sentiment" (*Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 163, Aug. 28, 1860).

⁶ *Vide infra*, pp.

⁹ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 145, Sept. 6, 1859.

¹⁰ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 145, Sept. 6, 1859.

¹¹ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, n.n., Feb. 7, 1859. Aldo Ferrari holds, on the contrary, that the annexations of 1860 in the Center were supported by the practically unanimous wish of the populations there (*La soluzione unitaria*, pp. 65-69). Cf. in opposite sense Giuseppe Ferrari (*L'annessione delle Due Sicilie*, p. 13): "In central Italy disarmed dictators proceed by means of oblique and dark conspiracies."

¹² There appeared from 1860 onward a rather extensive literature portraying the disadvantages of political centralization. The pamphlet *La centralizzazione e la libert *; *saggio*, by Francesco Perez (Palermo, 1862) sums up the chief arguments against a unitary government for Italy. Perez asserts that "centralization and liberty are contradictory ideas" (p. 3) and that no greater evil could be inflicted on Italy than the unitary system proposed by the Piedmontese party, since their program rides roughshod over local and provincial traditions of autonomy. The tactic of absolutism is always to confuse national unity with a highly centralized national state (p. 63).

says, he has held the opposite view. Of Parma, Modena, and the Romagna, he still feels certain. But he has received intelligence lately from Tuscany which makes him doubt somewhat the result of a secret ballot of the whole people in that province.¹³ Well-informed and eminent Tuscans with whom he has lately conversed, think that there is a majority against annexation. They believe that a fair ballot and universal suffrage will reveal this fact.¹⁴

Daniel then proceeds to give reasons why this should be so: Tuscany has hitherto received vast sums of money from strangers who went there while it had a Court of its own, but who will no longer go when it shall have sunk into the condition of a province. It has hitherto had no need of a large army, whereas, if annexed to Sardinia, it "must bear the heavy burdens and assume the disproportionate debt of this ambitious and expensive government."¹⁵

He concludes that it is clearly to the material interest of Tuscany to remain independent. But so great, he thinks, is the desire of all Italians to form a single strong nation, that the disinclination of the Tuscans will be surmounted.¹⁶

Cavour, says Daniel, presented in his memorandum "singularly original views" of public law to justify an interference which "may well startle the conscience of the world, if it has any," and which has had no parallel in national practice since the dismemberment of Poland.¹⁷ The American minister ridicules Cavour's protest against the Pope's use of force to prevent his subjects from rebelling against him,¹⁸ and he thinks that the Pope has all the law on his side.¹⁹

Some of Daniel's most important testimony has regard to the situation in the *Mezzogiorno*.

After the annexations in central Italy had been consummated, March, 1860, the unification party turned its attention to the South. On May 11, 1860, Garibaldi, with at least the tacit complaisance of Cavour, landed at Marsala in Sicily, to aid the rebels of that island who, according to the traditional story, were seeking separation from Naples and incorporation with the new and greater Piedmont. The leader of The Thousand soon made himself master of Sicily, then crossed to the main-

(Please turn to page fourteen)

¹³ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 139, Mar. 4, 1860.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 167, Sept. 18, 1860.

¹⁸ "... Cavour denounces the enrollment of foreigners in the Pope's army as something unheard of in the usage of nations ... But his heaviest charge against them is based on the fact that they prevent the Pope's subjects from rebelling against him; and he demands their dismissal for the expressed end that Umbria and the Marches may have an opportunity to 'manifest a national sentiment' or, in other words, that they may overthrow the government, which he addresses, without resistance by it. The tone is singularly harsh and even insolent, though less bitter than the Proclamation of the King, written by Farini ... which is probably unique even among declarations of war ..." (*Ibid.*)

¹⁹ "Antonelli's reply is wrathful and haughty. Having all the law on his side, he tears to pieces the Count's new doctrine on the employment of foreign legions, and lays at his adversary's door all the bloodshed of Perugia. He declares that insurrection has been gotten up in the papal states solely by the money and means of Cavour, that the people have no part in it; he refuses with indignation the demand, and defies the menace of Piedmont" (*Ibid.*).

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

JOHN F. BANNON, *Editor*

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY, *Associate Editor*

Staff

DONALD R. CAMPION
ORVILLE J. CATUSO
JAMES J. BERNA
EUGENE D. KELLY

WILLIAM H. STEINER
ROBERT S. JELINSKE
MARSHALL B. WINKLER
JOHN M. GINSTERBLUM

THOMAS O'B. HANLEY, *Business Manager*

Address communications to The Historical Bulletin, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Advisory Board

MARTIN P. HARNEY
Boston College
THOMAS F. MAHER
Gonzaga University
CHARLES H. METZGER
West Baden College

W. PATRICK DONNELLY
Spring Hill College
PETER M. DUNNE
University of San Francisco
GERALD G. WALSH
Fordham University

EDITORIAL

Postwar Planning and the Historian

It is in the air! Rare is the day that we pick up the newspaper and find no record of someone's postwar planning. Nations are doing it, so is business, colleges too, everybody and every group or organization. While not unaware that victory, though assured, is not yet won nor unmindful that we must continue to bend our best efforts to hasten its coming, still we cannot help looking forward. It is meet that we should, for today's sacrifices have meaning only in the hope of tomorrow's better world. War is a means to an end—thank God, we do not live in a nation which would have us believe the opposite.

In this rush of postwar planning we historians cannot lag behind our fellows. We must do a bit of it ourselves. The "we" means us teacher-historians rather than our envied brothers of the purely research variety. To these last the day of peace need have little significance beyond the contentment which it brings in knowing that once again their work can go on untrammelled, freed now from the welter of, almost certainly, uncongenial pre-occupations and duties which war inevitably brought in its train and which squared poorly with the necessary quiet and detachment which fruitful research demands. Libraries and archives again will be open to welcome the student; precious documentary treasures will come out of protective hiding; publishers and editors will no longer be able to keep findings wasting away in file cases on the plea of paper shortage, priority of government printing jobs, and those other familiar rejection formulae of these last years. The research man can take up where he left off. Barring the regrettable loss or destruction of materials and archival collections, the war may actually have proved a blessing to the scholar—quicker, cheaper transportation to distant, formerly almost inaccessible depositories, new and improved methods applicable to document reproduction, and a dozen other aids.

Readjustment

But can the teacher-historian take up where he left off? Can he resume the pattern of former days and former ways? Should he be content to do so? To all of these we feel that the answer is No! The war has not

been so generous in our regard. It will not have changed history—oh, certain traditional interpretations of man's recent past may need alterations; but the war will have changed us, changed the outlook of those to whom we teach history, and, most of all, changed the world in which we teach it. We must recognize the fact and act in accordance with the realization.

Even before the war there were changes in traditional patterns. Few of these were more soundly historical and more roundly beneficial than the shift which substituted the Western Civilization survey in freshman college for the older "Europe since 1500"—we finally came to see that an over-all integration, even granting its necessary superficial character, was preferable to a more concentrated study of decadent Western Civilization. Even more drastic changes are now in order.

Time was when the history of the United States was "American History." Today we know better. Tomorrow we must see that "American History" becomes truly American. Latin neighbors to the south have always been part of the larger "West" but they received scant recognition of their relationship to us or even to Europe. Time was when we could satisfy ourselves that knowledge of Europe's past was sufficient for our needs, and even then we paid slight attention to the eastern group of Europe's nations. Tomorrow such cannot be the case. European history can no longer be "bounded on the east" by the Adriatic, the Carpathians, and the Vistula. A new and tremendously important factor has entered in, namely Russia, no longer a sprawling, semi-Oriental, badly governed, more or less inconsequential power. And that East—Near, Middle, and especially Far—which we so frequently left to the elementary-school geography lesson, that East is ours to reckon with and to study. No, the war has not been kind to historians of our kind. There are hard days ahead for us, days of readjustment, days of extensive study, days of challenge.

Tradition has given us the *droit de cité* in the curriculum. Tomorrow may deny us that right, unless we can merit its continuance. We have much to give tomorrow's student. But we may have a disheartening selling job on our hands unless we can prove it. The world

has moved ahead, and youth has kept or hopes to keep pace. Neither the returning veteran nor his younger brother or sister, who has not learned to think in fox-holes but who, none the less, has some definite ideas, will accept the old pattern merely brushed up. It is so easy for us to do just that; much less simple to rip it out and with the same material offer something new and fresh.

The boys and girls, young men and young women to whom we shall teach history are no longer to be simply future citizens of the United States. They are to be citizens of a big broad world. They will need to know more about that world than they formerly did. Business, with the airplane brought back to serve the purposes of peace, is apt to take them far afield from the home-town, the home-state, the geographic section. We can have our share in preparing them to carry themselves well in strange surroundings. Diplomacy may take others just as far. And these, especially, we want to be well trained, their outlook broad, their knowledge deep, their sympathies sound. The task of "making the peace stick" will, unquestionably, take others to distant parts. Why should they not be so schooled that the months abroad might add to their culture and their knowledge, rather than be spent merely in the tedious routine of "serving a hitch"? As always happens, however, the vast majority of our young men and women will stay at home. But they must not be forgotten. To aid in the formation of an enlightened public opinion, grounded on solid knowledge, a wholesome world outlook, is another challenge to the teacher. The historian is not the only person in the educational hierarchy who can contribute—we would reject the thought of a messianic role. But he or she has very much to give—if a bit of repetition be permitted. We can give the student man, man as he was, 'tis true; but man is man wherever he be or in whatever age he lives. More than that we can give him national man. One knows and understands the son the better for becoming acquainted with the father and, perhaps, the grandfather, too. But these are banalities which merit restatement only because it is betimes worthwhile to recall and review.

Integration

There is one thought which has struck this writer and which he passes on to the reader, for it may add a stimulus to some fruitful postwar planning. We are all acquainted, to some degree at least, with the program which the Army's AMG is following and its AST: Foreign Area-Language Program followed in preparing young Americans to deal effectively with stranger peoples. The training was peculiarly well adapted. It is, perhaps, too early to test the programs by their results, but they certainly should work. One of the keys to the programs was the breakdown of what we educators might call subject or departmental lines in the interest of giving the student a fuller background. Language, history, social and political and economic institutions, religion, ideologies, geography, and a dozen more aspects of complicated human life were set down as subjects to be studied and, if possible, mastered. This writer wonders if some adaptation of such an approach may not be an answer to the problem of revitalizing our teaching of history to meet the inevitable demands of tomorrow's

new world? It will be the rare teacher-historian who is possessed of the varied background requisite to be able to give the student this highly complex yet beautifully integrated picture of a people and a culture. But this is probably what the student of tomorrow may demand. Remember he is likely to be—and for the good of all of us we hope he is—much more internationally minded than his older brother or sister was during school or college days. But back to the problem! Need the historian count solely on his own knowledge? Why not call upon the competences of colleagues? Might it not be wise as well as possible, to devise a program which would integrate the data of various subject fields? Some type of a cross-section unit in the secondary curriculum? A more broadly conceived major on the college level? Why, after all, should history, sociology, government, economics, literature, language be left as isolated units—as they too often have been in the past? Let the Army teach us a lesson, both as educators and as historians.

One may object that such a system of integration would tend to be one-sided. That is a valid rejoinder, for it is true that neither four years of high school nor four additional years of college would be sufficient to prepare the student for all emergencies. But is there not the possibility that we might teach him a system, give him something of a master blueprint to be applied to other areas? This is not a plea for area concentration. Such would be a warped and unbalanced program, and, hence, undesirable. However, the whole idea might merit both consideration and a serious trial.

History cannot afford, and we cannot afford to allow it, to become a dry and dead subject. If it is not living, then the teacher should think of how he or she can escape a murder charge. Were we to do no more postwar planning than to devise ways and means to keep ourselves alive and our subject lively, we would be doing something worthwhile. But we must go beyond that.

One thing of which we can be almost positive in our speculations concerning the World of Tomorrow is that science is going to know a tremendous upsurge in educational appeal. There are educators who are worried at this too-evident trend towards what might be termed "mechanization." They feel that the humanities are going to be hard put to hold their place in the curriculum. Many of the old-line subjects are threatened. Man may have to yield to the machine or, at least, to physical nature in the hierarchy of student interests. We wonder if it is too much to contend that, perhaps, it may be the job of history to keep the study of man alive, until time proves to impetuous and over-eager youths that all things in this world are important only in proportion as they serve man, king of the universe, to achieve his God-given destiny? If that is to be the situation—and it quite conceivably can turn out so—then we teacher-historians have a great task ahead. The tradition of liberal education may rest with us. Let us prepare to cope adequately with such a potential destiny. Think clearly! Think soundly! Think ahead!

A Word for Geography

While we historians are learning lessons from the Army and its training programs, we might also take heed of

(Please turn to page eighteen)

The "Anti-Jesuit Law" of 1647

Edward L. Hirsch, Ph. D.

St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Connecticut

THE New England Puritans of the seventeenth century regarded none of their opponents with more fear than they did the Jesuits. Looking upon the Catholic Church as veritably anti-Christian and the Pope as literally Anti-Christ, the Puritans nevertheless singled out from the whole Catholic oody the Society of Jesus as the most dangerous, because apparently most skillful, enemy of the Reformation. Almost any Puritan writing selected at random will yield at least some references to the wiles and unscrupulousness of the Jesuits, and many such works are filled with a constant stream of abusive attacks upon them. It is, therefore, not entirely surprising that Massachusetts Bay colony should have passed a law designed to protect its orthodox church members from any possible missionary activity by priests in general and by Jesuits in particular. What is surprising is that the so-called "anti-Jesuit law" was enacted in 1647. If the Puritan suspicion of Catholics, and especially of Jesuits, were the sole cause of the law, it is almost impossible to explain the lapse of some seventeen years between the founding of the colony and the passing of the law. Thus, C. M. Andrews declares that "the reasons for the passage of the Act of 1647 are far from clear."¹ Various explanations for its enactment at this particular time have been suggested. Andrews, noting the improbability of any Jesuits being in Massachusetts with intent to proselytize, suggests as possible immediate causes for the passage, a contemporary intensifying of suspicion against Catholics, acquaintance with seamen of Spanish and Portuguese wine-ships, and contacts with LaTour and the French of Acadia.² He also refers to the rumor that Dr. Child, leader of the Remonstrants of 1646, was a Jesuit in disguise.³ On the other hand, Father Hughes, in commenting on the law of 1647, seems to accept the explanation that the law was designed to end internal divisions and thus to serve a purpose of domestic policy.⁴

It is indeed probable that some or all of the explanations mentioned played a part in the enactment of the law. But the rôle of no one of these could have been decisive. The contacts with LaTour and the Acadians had become frequent five years previously and had apparently caused little alarm in Puritan hearts. LaTour had showed himself ready even to attend church in Boston to oblige the Puritans, and had, complained the Capuchins at Port Royal, permitted the heretics to offer public prayers on his ship in the very presence of a Recollet friar.⁵ There was obviously no religious danger from that quarter. Although Massachusetts was for a time on the verge of war with D'Aulnay, a pact was signed with

him in 1643, and there is no evidence that the Capuchins associated with him were regarded as dangerous missionaries, or that they made any effort deliberately to penetrate the boundaries of Massachusetts Bay in search of converts. The fear of disguised Jesuits or secular priests landing with the crews of wine-ships and the desire to pass sweeping laws in defense of orthodoxy after the excitement caused by the Remonstrants may have been more immediate stimulants to legislation. The chief cause, however, was probably an episode which led the Puritans to believe that Jesuits were actually attempting to enter the colony—a constant Puritan fear—and which consequently accounts both for the Jesuits being singled out for special mention in the enactment, and for the careful framing of the law which seems designed to meet a real and serious threat, not simply to express a sweeping statement of policy. In providing, first banishment and then, upon subsequent arrest, death for any Jesuit, seminary priest, or ecclesiastical person ordained by the authority of the Pope, the law specifically exempted priests who came into the colony by shipwreck or accident, or who were sent on diplomatic errands.

A Precipitating Event

On August 29, 1646, a French Jesuit of the Canadian mission, Father Gabriel Druilletes, left Sillery to winter with the Abenaki Indians, who had frequently requested that a missionary might visit them. First going down the Kennebec River its whole length, he came to an English settlement, *ou il fut tres-bien receu*. He then returned up the river; but resumed this mission, the Mission of the Assumption, in October. The Indian who guided him on the second journey took him not only to Kinibeki on the river, but to seven or eight English settlements on the coast of the "sea of Acadia"; at these he was very well received, according to his own account. Before returning to Kinibeki, Druilletes was given provisions and some letters for the English commander there by one Sieur Chaste at an unspecified English town. In the letters Chaste declared that he found in the priest nothing that was not praiseworthy; that the father was not at all inclined to trade; and that the savages testified to the father's sole interest in their instruction and to his risking of his life for their salvation. In short, concluded the writer, he admired the Jesuit's courage. At Kinibeki Druilletes was received with all conceivable courtesy, but the captain in charge, called by him "Hoinsland," shortly afterwards went off to Plymouth and to Boston—to report, we may well imagine, upon the astonishing visit of a French Jesuit so far south. During November and December the priest remained a league above Kinibeki, where the Indians had built him a small chapel, but in January, or possibly in February, of 1647, he paid a second visit to Kinibeki. Again he was received with good will. The English captain, however, had much to say of his winter sojourn in Plymouth and Boston. There, as he told Father Druilletes, he had communicated Chaste's letter to twenty-four of the most eminent

¹ Charles M. Andrews: *The Colonial Period of American History; the Settlements: I* (New Haven, 1934), 469.

² *ibid.*, 469.

³ *ibid.*, 470, n. 1.

⁴ Thomas Hughes, S. J., *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal: Text: II* (London, 1917), 109-110.

⁵ *Collection des Manuscrits Relatifs a la Nouvelle France* (Quebec, 1883), I, 118.

persons of New England, including four of the most famous ministers. These men all approved Druilletes' design, saying frankly that to instruct the savages was a good and generous action, and *qu'il en falloit venir Dieu*. Finally the captain concluded his narration with the statement that the English of Kinibeki would permit the French to build houses on the river, and would permit the priest to serve them unmolested, even hinting broadly that there were English Catholics in the region who would be glad to see a priest. In answer, Druilletes promised to write if the plan seemed feasible, and then set out in May for Sillery, which he reached on June 15, 1647.⁶

The story of Druilletes' mission is interesting not only for what it explicitly states, but also for what is revealed between its lines. That twenty-four of the most eminent men in Plymouth and Boston, including four of the most famous ministers, should have approved a French Jesuit's efforts to convert Indians to Roman Catholicism is literally incredible. John Eliot might possibly have expressed such an attitude, but Eliot was frequently an exception; the general Puritan detestation of Jesuits and the particular opposition to, and deploring of, Jesuit missionary endeavor in America are evidenced in countless New England books, pamphlets, and sermons. The meeting of the twenty-four, in fact, suggests a council called to consider a serious danger revealed by the Plymouth agent who may have returned to his colony precisely to ask advice. The reference to Boston further suggests a conference such as was often called by the two colonies when difficult problems presented themselves. Although Druilletes himself, as he was to show again during his journey to New England in 1650, was always ready to believe almost naively the fair words of even determined opponents, it seems rather apparent to the reader that the Kinibeki commander had been instructed to avoid alarming the Jesuit and to discover, discreetly, any plans of Druilletes or of the French for approaching Plymouth territory. The obviously untrue declaration that the French would be welcome to build houses along the Kennebec, and that a priest would be permitted publicly to minister to them in English territory, was evidently a leading statement, which failed to elicit a revelation simply because Druilletes had nothing to reveal. But the effort to acquire information and the summoning of the conference were indications of alarm in the new Zion. Heretofore the Jesuits of Canada had been fairly remote; now it seemed that they were designing to win the Abenaki Indians to Popery and the French interest and to execute, perhaps, some dark plan against Puritan orthodoxy. Ever alert to Jesuit menaces, the Puritans must have felt that their watch had not been in vain. It is no coincidence that knowledge of Druilletes' penetration to the English settlements in the fall and winter of 1646 was followed by a law directed against Catholic missionaries, notably Jesuits, in 1647.

Another Possible Cause

Insofar as other events may have contributed to the

enactment of the law, the anti-Catholic outbreaks in Maryland must be taken into account as possibly influential. The Maryland revolution of 1645, introducing the two years of anarchy known as the "Plundering Time," was chiefly justified by its leaders as a defense of Protestantism against Popish plots. "Pirate Ingle," who took the lead in riot and plunder, represented himself to England and to the other colonies as the champion of the Protestant cause and defended his violence to Catholics as merely a forestalling of action by "wicked papists and malignants."⁷ The outcry of the self-styled Protestant protectors had its echoes in London. On February 8, 1646/7 eighteen London merchants petitioned the House of Lords to reclaim Maryland from Lord Baltimore on the grounds that Baltimore and his agents "have acted horrid things in that Province as Papists and Rebels."⁸ Nor did the efforts of the Maryland Puritans—or, of those who posed as Protestant zealots—stop at petitions and seizure of property. In the first year of the revolt against the proprietary government Ingle and his accomplices took prisoner Fathers Andrew White and Philip Fisher, claiming that they, as Jesuits, were leading conspirators in a plot to destroy all Protestants. White and Fisher were deported to England and there tried as traitors, since they had entered the kingdom as priests. Having proved that they were brought into England by force, they were finally released and ordered to leave the country. White, later arrested again, was imprisoned in the Tower from 1646 to 1648. The capture and trial of these two Jesuits, as well as Ingle's charges against them, must have been well known in New England, both from commercial intercourse with Maryland and from the information of the Parliamentary party in England, with which the Boston leaders were in close touch. Also known may have been the flight of three other Jesuit missionaries from Maryland into Virginia, and the probable treatment they received. The deaths of the three occurred in 1646, caused, it would seem, by "the cruelty of the heretics."⁹ The seizure of White and Fisher and the expulsion of their colleagues was one act in a general and violent anti-Catholic movement that was widely acclaimed by those who believed the justification offered for it by the Maryland and Virginia Protestants. The rioters' boast that they had saved in America the Protestant church and its members was naturally acceptable and credible to the New England Puritans, who themselves spoke often of the Catholic menace. Events in Maryland seemed but further proof that Catholics, especially Jesuits, were planning constantly the ruin of non-Catholics and the overthrow of all lawful and godly authority; these events, moreover, must have shocked New England by the lesson to be drawn from them—that even in the American colonies the Jesuits were at work, and that the danger to the Protestant church might be near and immediate. Perhaps the "Plunder

(Please turn to page eighteen)

⁷ Bernard C. Steiner, "Maryland during the English Civil Wars: Part II," *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, xxv (1907), 208.

⁸ *ibid.*, 209.

⁹ See Hughes, *op. cit.*, 10-12, for the fate of the Jesuits who fled from Maryland.

⁶ R. G. Thwaites, ed.: *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, xxxi (Cleveland, 1898), 182-207. This is Chapter X of the Relation of 1647, written by Father Lalement from Father Druilletes' own account of his mission.

The Monastic Corrody

E. J. Kurth, S. J., M. A.

St. Louis University High School, St. Louis, Mo.

FROM twentieth to fourteenth century England is a far cry. It takes us back through many ages; back past modern imperial England, the Industrial Revolution, the struggle with the colonies; past the period of the Stuarts and the Tudors; past the religious upheaval which wrought such havoc on the heritage which Gregory the Great had bequeathed to the Britons through St. Augustine of Canterbury; back to the age of Catholic Christianity, to the England which was dotted with monastic foundations large and small. Each of the monastic ruins which cover England's country-side—this tumbled down chapel, that crumbling vine-covered wall, even those disordered piles of stones—tells its own tale. All were once the homes of monastic communities, some large, some very tiny, but all of them vital cells of the one great living reality: the Church of Christ.

Why are they gone? Why do crumbling ruins of church and chantry dot the English landscape today? We have heard the reasons time and again. One man's cupidity and pride was the principal factor, but underlying the conduct of Henry VIII were other factors that brought about the dissolution of the monasteries and left those scattered heaps of weatherbeaten stones as a sorrowful reminder of Catholic England.

The historian knows the important part that lesser factors sometimes play in determining the outcome or the particular direction of some historical event. Had the terrific storm not occurred the night before Waterloo, would Napoleon have suffered exactly the same defeat with his batteries and caissons in place? The decree of Mary Tudor near the end of her reign against the Irish heretics was replaced by a pack of playing cards in the satchel of her Commissioner, Dr. Cole. Succeeding events were entirely different because of this small factor. It is with another such contributing factor, to the Reformation in England—that we are here concerned: the monastic corrody and its abuse, a subject which has remained in large measure unnoticed by scholars and certainly untouched by authors of textbooks.

Nature of the Corrody

The monastic corrody, in brief, was an allowance to some person or persons for life, of food, drink, lodging, and sometimes clothing, made by a monastery in return for a money payment, property granted, or services rendered to the monastery. These services were rendered either to the monastery itself,—for example, a chaplain or a porter performing his duties about the monastery—or to a king or prince, who as founder or protector of the monastery claimed what was called "the right of corrody" in that house. By this right he could send old friends, retired servants or helpers to be supported at the monastery while recovering from illness or even more frequently to the end of their days. They were to be given a home, their flagon of ale, bread and cheese on ordinary days (or their fowl and pudding on feast days) in daily or weekly allowance from the stores of the monastery. In the following paragraphs we shall see more of

the exact forms these grants of corrody took and how abuses readily crept in.

The earlier forms of monastic corrodies seem to have been those granted by the monks themselves; those granted by the king were of later origin, notably increasing in number as the fourteenth century progressed. Thus we find that as early as 1219 the General Chapter of the Black Monks of Oxford¹ had to pass a regulation forbidding the granting of corrodies without the consent of the chapter, and in 1221 the Black Monks of the Province of York had to enact a like prohibition.² From these examples and their repetition in 1249 and 1277, as well as from other documents that have come down to us, we may conclude that there was need of such legislation, for it must have been a very serious matter to have attracted the attention of so many of the General Chapters of the period. The seriousness of the issue was heightened in 1287 when the General Chapter of the Province of York had to forbid *Obedienciarii*, or lower officials of the monastery from selling corrodies without the consent of the abbot and the convent.

The corrodies granted by the king or founder by reason of the "right of corrody" which he was said to exercise in the monastery because of his donations occasioned the most trouble. In such cases the patron would send a person or persons to the monastery with what was called a writ *de corrodio habendo*, the formula of which generally ran something like this:

The king salutes his beloved in Christ, the Prior and Convent of N., wishing concerning our beloved (valet) S. that he be provided with sustenance. We have sent him to you asking that in so far as you admit the same S. into your house, you should render unto him in the same manner such sustenance in all things just as P. had while he was alive; and also asking that you make out, with reference to him, letters stamped with the common seal of your house, making mention of those things which he will thus receive from this same house of yours, taking account for yourselves that this be done and given in payment to him, for the doing of which things we shall hold your well beloved house in special remembrance for the future, and what things you shall have done in accordance with this our request, notify us by means of the present bearer.³

The monastery in turn usually drew up a document in chapter which stated the rights of the corrodian. An example of such a document is that drawn up at Vale Royal in 1330 for Richard Bradeford in return for a grant of land made to the monastery:

Know all men by these present, etc., that we, Pater abbot of Vale Royal, and the convent of the same place, have given, etc., to Richard, son of Ralph de Bradeford, for his maintenance for the whole of his life, a corrody of bread and convent ale, to wit, one loaf of white convent bread with "Kybet," one flagon of the better ale each day, to be received from the aforesaid abbey, to be delivered to the said Richard or his duly appointed servant without delay or neglect twice every week; for which corrody of bread and ale, granted in form as aforesaid, the aforesaid Ralph de Bradeford has given to us 2½ burgages in the vill of Murifeld and all the land which Roger Carpenter formerly held, with a warranty of the same. And we bind us and our successors

¹ Camden Society Publications. *Documents Illustrating the Activities of the General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215-1540*, I, 9.

² *Ibid.*, I, 233.

³ Anthony Fitzherbert, *La Novel Natura Brevium*, London: John More, 1635.

faithfully to keep and observe all these things, with distraint of all our moveable goods, etc. Given in the year 1330.⁴

The number of corrodians the patron could rightfully have in any one monastery at one time was usually determined by the amount of the indebtedness of the monastery to him. As a matter of fact, however, the patrons often overstepped their mark and the monks had to complain, as the following entry in the *Statutes of the Realm* shows:

Also it is desired that our Lord the King, and the great man of the Realm do not charge Religious Houses, or Spiritual Persons, for Corrodies, pensions, or sojourning in Religious Houses, and other Places of the Church, or with taking up Horse or Carts, whereby such Houses are impoverished, and God's Service diminished, and by reason of such charges, Priests and other Ministers of the Church deputed unto divine Service, are oftentimes compelled to depart from the Places Aforesaid.

The Answer. The King's Pleasure is, that upon the contents in their Petition, from henceforth they shall not be unduly charged. And if the contrary be done by great Men or others, they shall have remedy after the form of the Statutes made in the Time of King Edward, Father to the King, that now is. And like Remedy shall be done for Corrodies and Pensions exacted by compulsion, whereof no mention is made in the Statutes.⁵

Classification of Corrodies

Since the corrody was, as we have seen, some claim made upon the goods of the monastery, there should be some reason or basis upon which this claim rested. An analysis of the various forms of corrodies which are mentioned in the English documents reveals a seven-fold foundation for the claim of right of corrody in a monastery. Corrodies were granted: by right of patronage; for money paid; for land granted; for services rendered; upon the creation of a new abbot or abbess (this right was usually held by the patron or founder); for a deposed or retired prior; as an act of charity performed for the soul of a departed brother.

The investigation into particular cases from each of the above mentioned classes will clarify their nature. Just exactly how or when this right of corrody by reason of foundation or patronage came into being is uncertain. The earliest case mentioned in *Victoria County Series* is that of the Abbey of Abbotsbury in 1244:

Abbotsbury escaped none of the burdens incidental to a religious house of any importance under the royal patronage. In 1244 Henry Lombard was sent to the abbot and convent with a request that they would find him the necessities of life in their house.⁶ Early in the fourteenth century, however, we find that it is a recognized right. In 1310 one Juliana la Despenser approached the gates of the Abbey of Romsey and presented letters under privy seal to the abbess and convent. These letters contained her writ *de corrodio habendo*. There is no mention of any opposition offered. The historian of the County of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight relates the incident taken from a document included in the Close Rolls:

The claim of the Crown to enforce the payment of corrodies and pensions from monasteries under its patronage, to persons nominated by it, was frequently insisted upon at Romsey. In June, 1310, Juliana la Despenser was sent with letters under privy seal to the abbess and convent to be provided with fitting maintenance for herself and her maid during her lifetime.⁷

With regard to the selling of corrodies for needed money, the positive documentary evidence is somewhat

disappointing. This dearth of evidence can undoubtedly be attributed to the fact that the selling of corrodies by the abbot or prior without consent of the convent was positively forbidden; and the selling of corrodies without episcopal permission, even *concessu conventi*, (with consent of the Convent) was forbidden early in the fourteenth century. Consequently, if such corrodies were sold, this was, more often than not, done secretly.

The negative evidence is more plentiful. We have seen above that the Black Monks were confronted with this problem as early as the first quarter of the thirteenth century, and the records of episcopal visitations of the fourteenth century give evidence of the existence of this same evil. The injunctions placed upon the monasteries following the visit of an Ordinary frequently contained some phrase such as: "Corrodies, annual pensions, long leases of granges were strictly forbidden . . ."⁸ Or, as Bishop Wickwane enjoined the abbess of the Priory of Nunkeeling in 1314: "In important business she was to take counsel with her sisters, and all were forbidden to lease manors, sell corrodies, . . . without episcopal permission."⁹

Besides much negative evidence, there are on the other hand some positive incidents relating to the sale of corrodies. Thus:

In 1320, when the convent was in urgent need of money, John de Somery, rector of Bishampton, who already held a corrody, paid 140 marks for further privileges. Many other corrodies are entered in the Landboec, in which there are other indications of financial difficulties.¹⁰

Somewhat related to the above mentioned claims for patronage or money payment is the claim resulting from lands granted to a monastery. Under this classification there are some very interesting examples from available documentary sources, some of which are what may be termed in common parlance "gifts with strings tied to them." Such especially seems to be the grant made to the Premonstratensians of the Abbey of Bayham:

The corrody granted to Simon Payn, who had given the convent 150 acres of land in Friston, in 1290. By this the canons covenanted not only to support Simon and his wife for the rest of their life, making the usual detailed allowance of food, beer, clothing, &c., but also to support his son Henry, a crippled clerk, who was to minister to them as far as his health allowed, to teach his two younger sons some trade within the precincts until they could support themselves, to give certain moneys to his four daughters, and to pay off various debts.¹¹ One sometimes wonders who was the better off in a deal like this.

In studying the corrodies granted by the various monasteries we find the following comment in the history of the Benedictine Cathedral Priory of Bath: "Sir John Garrard, chaplain, was granted a corrody and living and the chamber which Peter de Derby had. This probably was the ordinary provision for a priest necessary from the small number of priests among the monks."¹² This seems to imply that the practice of granting a corrody to a priest was rather common. As a matter of fact, in the history of the Commandery of Skirbeck, a house of the Knights Templars, we find the following statement: ". . . there were two corrody holders attached to the house, both chaplains."¹³

⁴ *The Ledger-Book of Vale Royal Abbey* edited by John Brownhill. Original Documents Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire. V, lxviii.

⁵ *The Statutes of the Realm: 9 Edw. II. Stat. 1 Articuli Cleri*, (A. D. 1315-16) c. 11.

⁶ *Victoria History of the Counties of England: Dorset*, II, 50.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, II, 128.

⁸ *Ibid.*, York, III, 124.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Gloucester, II, 69.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Sussex, II, 86.

¹² *Ibid.*, Somerset, II, 75.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Lincoln, II, 210.

With regard to other servants of the monasteries who were granted corrodies, we find mention of a corrody bestowed on the gatekeeper at the Priory of Sale, and also one given to the cantor, "whose duty it was to sing at high Mass, and to teach four boys and a monk to play the organ"¹⁴ at the Abbey of Muchelney; again at the Cathedral Priory of Bath it was the physician, the plumber, and the glazier who were thus paid for their services.

The question of the granting of a corrody by the king on the creation of a new abbot or abbess presents the difficulty of distinguishing between the words, pension and corrody. In his *Commentaries* Blackstone says, "Corrodies are a right of sustenance, or to receive certain allotments of victual and provision for one's maintenance. In lieu of which (especially when due from ecclesiastical persons) a pension or sum of money is sometimes substituted."¹⁵ Another commentator on the laws of England says:

Corrody signifies a sum of money, or allowance of meat, drink, and clothing due to the king from an abbey, or other house of religion, whereof he was founder, towards the sustentation of such a one of his servants as he thought fit to bestow it upon. The difference between a 'corrody' and 'pension' seems to be, that a 'corrody' was allowed towards the Maintenance of any of the king's servants in an abbey: a pension is given to one of the king's chaplains, for his better maintenance, till he may be provided of a benefice.¹⁶

The more common expression used for a grant due when a new abbot or abbess was elected runs as follows:

The right of the Crown at each election of an abbess to nominate a clerk to receive a pension from the monastery until he should be provided with a suitable benefice was exercised from time to time.¹⁷

The qualifications for this grant would then be: 1) given by the king only on the creation of a new abbot or abbess, 2) to a clerk, i.e., to one of the clerics about the court or on intimate terms with the king, 3) for a limited time, i.e., until there should be an opportunity for promotion to a good benefice. Although this grant is loosely termed a corrody by some of the contributors to the Victoria County Series it cannot be called a corrody according to our definition since it is not made for life.

Our next division brings us to a consideration of the allowances granted to retired priors by the monasteries. There are various examples of such a grant, but we shall cite only enough to clarify the point. In 1379 the deposed prior William le Breton was granted the following:

The prior was allowed fourteen white loaves and fourteen gallons of better beer, with 8d. for *companagium* every week, and an allowance of 20s. a year, with corrodies and pay for a servant and a stable boy.¹⁸

The normal allowance for a retiring abbot seems to have been one and one-half or two canons' portions, one garcione, one servant and a room or two as is testified in the history of the Priory of Lanercost:

The nature of the retiring allowance which John de (Bothe-castre) Bewcastle received in 1354 throws a much needed light on the simple habits of the cloistered life in the fourteenth century. It was ordained by Bishop Welton that Brother John, broken with old age and burdened with weakness of body, should have for the term of his life a fit place to dwell within the confines of the priory: two canonical allowances daily of meat and

drink, two pair of new boots and two pairs of new socks at such times of the year when these articles of apparel were usually delivered, a sufficient supply of fire and light, and 46s. 8d., in lieu of clothing and other necessities payable at three terms of the year, viz., at Christmas, 13s. 4d., at Pentecost, 20s., and at Michaelmas, 13s. 4d. The bishop also, out of respect to his former station, required the convent to make him an allowance for a valet with suitable livery or half a mark in lieu thereof.¹⁹

A very interesting form of corrody is that provided for a defunct brother. It is difficult to determine how widespread this custom was, but from the fact that it is mentioned in the history of the Priory of Hurley we know that it also existed at Westminster:

An ordinance of Prior Henry and the convent of Hurley, in 1313, decided that the custom observed at Westminster Abbey, of continuing to a defunct brother for a year after his death the daily corrody in the refectory and his clothing allowance as though still alive, to provide for a year's masses for his soul being said by a secular priest, should henceforth be maintained at Hurley.²⁰

Content of the Corrody

It was stated above that the corrody generally included an allowance of food, drink, and lodging; but besides these we may add that rather frequently there was also an allowance of clothing made, and on occasion even an allowance of shoeleather. In some cases it was merely stated that the corrodian should "receive maintenance in food, clothing, shoeleather, and other necessities of life."²¹ At other times the specification for clothing was made in terms of robes, i.e., one robe a year or two robes a year of such and such a stuff. One reference specifies, "a robe with fur every year,"²² another says, "robes for the grooms of the suit of the abbot's grooms,"²³ and Edith, the wife of John Machon at St. Denis, Southampton was to receive "six yards of coloured cloth of the suit of the esquire's for her robe on All Saints Day."²⁴ An ex-prior of the priory of Thurganton was "To receive yearly two marks for clothing" besides "due provisions in clothing for his attendant and his garcione."²⁵

The usual procedure by which a corrodian obtained his food and drink is stated in a charter from Gloucester. Food and drink were "to be fetched from the altar daily or from the brewery and bakehouse weekly."²⁶ Nevertheless, there was at Gloucester, according to a charter of the very next year (1350), a case in which the corrodian was to eat "in the hall when the Abbot is present, or elsewhere when he is away."²⁷ This privilege was for William Cheverel, the clerk of the bailiffs and stewards of manors. Another corrodian in the same convent of Gloucester in the same year had "the right to eat in the abbot's great hall on the seven festivals."²⁸

Effects of Corrodies on Monasteries.

Our treatment of English monastic corrodies would be incomplete were we to neglect a consideration of the effect these corrodies had on the monasteries. One of the important effects of the "right of corrody" held by the patron was the frequency with which it became a cause of litigation between the patron and the monastery. Many such cases can be found in *The Statutes of the*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Cumberland, II, 155. ²⁰ *Ibid.*, Berkshire, II, 235.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Kent, II, 173. ²² *Ibid.*, Dorset, II, 60.

²³ *Ibid.*, Essex, II, 131.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, II, 162.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, Nottingham, II, 123.

²⁶ *Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series*, xxxviii, #119.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, #120.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Somerset, II, 104.

¹⁵ William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, II, 40, (J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1858).

¹⁶ Giles Jacob, *A New Law-Dictionary*: (London: Nutt and Gosling, 1739).

¹⁷ V. C. S. Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, II, 134.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Bedford, I, 375.

Realm: Edw. I, II, III. In 1327 Edward III made the following promise in this regard:

Whereas Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Priors, (Abesses, and Prioreesses) have been before this time sore grieved by the King's Requests and his progenitors, which have desired them by great threats, for their Clerks and other Servants, for great Pensions, Prebends, Churches and Corrodies, so that they might nothing give nor do to such as had done them Service, nor to their Friends to their Charge and Damage; The King granteth, that from henceforth he will no more such Things desire but where he ought.²⁰

The difficulty proved to be in deciding when and from whom "he ought."

The financial burden which these corrodies entailed were also detrimental to the general well-being of the monasteries. That this statement is true can easily be shown by the reports of certain priories, by the decrees of episcopal visitations, and by the pleas made by kings that the patrons should not overburden the monasteries with such demands.

From the foregoing considerations it has become more and more clear that the corrodies were a contributing factor to the decline of the monasteries. It is an undeniable fact that they at least augmented the financial difficulties of many of the houses and were the cause of many legal cases between the crown and the monasteries as well as between individuals and the monasteries. Such repeated litigations could have had but one result—a growing irritation on the part of the crown.

There is another factor, however, which should not be overlooked, the disciplinary problem which the presence of the corrodians within the monasteries must have caused. It is difficult to find much positive evidence with reference to this point; it is not so difficult to imagine that many disciplinary problems would arise from the corrody system. For example—although the case is probably unique or at least rather rare—the presence of Alice de Morton, a widow, within the Abbey of Kenilworth in 1317 (as related in the history of Warwickshire) must certainly have created a problem. Again, there were many cases where husband and wife were corrodians and these too must have presented their own particular difficulties. The number of corrodians, too, must have caused a disciplinary problem, since in some places there were from nine to thirty-six such externs living within the monastery.

All these abuses were bad enough, but what of the evils caused by persons of bad character who visited corrodians, or worse yet, obtained corrodies for themselves? That such was actually the case we gather from the fact that by 1336 the abbey of St. Augustin, Bristol, had come to such a state that:

Edward III took the monastery under his special protection, and entrusted the custody to Maurice of Berkeley and three other commissioners. He intervened because it was likely that the poverty of the house would compel the canons to disperse. The abbots had resorted to disastrous financial shifts. They had sold corrodies to persons of evil life who were then living within the precincts; they had made bad bargains for the convent in the leases which they had granted; and the expenses of their households were excessive.²⁰

From these considerations based on the available documents of the fourteenth century it seems that the corrody should be placed among the many causes contrib-

uting to the decline of monastic life in those times. The frequent cases of litigation brought against the crown led to strained relations between king and monks. The sale of corrodies and the maintenance of the corrodians increased the financial burdens, while the presence of the corrodians and their friends within the monastic enclosure must certainly have increased the disciplinary problems.

Italian Unification

(Continued from page six)

land, routed the Neapolitan army, and on September 7 entered in triumph the city of Naples.

Cavour, now fearing the impulsive and radical tendencies of his swashbuckling ally, sent Piedmontese troops to Naples as a kind of chaperone for Garibaldi. The situation was thus kept well in hand by the Moderates, and, on October 21-22, Naples and Sicily voted by plebiscite for annexation to Piedmont. On the 25th of the same month, Garibaldi saluted Victor Emmanuel at Caianello as King of Italy.

To Daniel's mind, the spontaneity and popularity of the unification movement in Naples and Sicily does not appear to be very genuine. After noting the attempted revolution at Naples in the early spring of 1860, and its successful resistance by the king, the American minister expressed his doubts as to whether the people of Naples desired a different government from that which they possessed. He is not sure, furthermore, that they are fit for any other.²⁰

He feels that the revolution has been artificially "worked up" by the "political people of northern Italy," who are determined to overthrow the Bourbon government and to effect either of two ends: annex the Two Sicilies to Piedmont, or establish in the South a new monarch who will act with Piedmont in the latter's ultimate designs on Venice.²¹

In June, however, after Garibaldi's seizure of the city of Naples, Daniel's views have changed. He felt that one of those great movements of nations and races which have from time to time altered the political condition and relative proportions of European states is now on foot in this peninsula. What passes here is not the work of individuals, of factions, or even of parties. It is the general sentiment and unanimous volition of nearly all the inhabitants of Italy. There is a universal determination of all its people . . . to do away with their former system of divided government and to unite in one body. When twenty millions of people, having already some general bonds and means of union at their command, become possessed of an idea and wish so general and deep as that which now prevails here, it is quite impossible to resist or thwart them. A nation under such circumstances accomplishes its destiny with the force and certainty of the elements, blind to consequences and deaf to both menace and persuasion.²²

This opinion, so favorable to unification, seems to be Daniel's most considered judgment at this time. His

(Please turn to page nineteen)

²⁰ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 143, Apr. 10, 1860.

²¹ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 145, Apr. 21, 1860.

²² *Italy*, Vol. VII, No. 151, June 12, 1860.

²³ It is to be noted, however, that Daniel notes a few weeks later that the king of Naples has granted a constitution and "put an end to the system of repression at Naples," but that the effect has been only to render more manifest the determination of a large party in the kingdom to unite it to that of Victor Emmanuel (*Italy*, Vol. VII, No. 158, July 24, 1860). There may or may not be significance in Daniel's use in this despatch of the expression 'large party' instead of 'the people'.

²⁰ *The Statutes of the Realm: Edw. III. Stat. 2, (A.D. 1326-27)* c. 10.

³⁰ V. C. S. Gloucester, II, 77.

The Constitution

(Continued from page four)

taken the leadership in the fight for independence, who had written property qualifications for suffrage and office into the state constitutions. The framers of the Constitution, after rejecting property qualifications for federal office, gave the states control of the suffrage. They did nothing to prevent "the levelers," supposedly the object of their fears, from broadening the suffrage in the states and therefore, in national politics.

It is not surprising that the public and the framers were property-minded. The Lockean view on property was widely known and apparently widely approved. Many had read or had been told how Locke made protection of property the very *raison d'être* of government.⁸ A few quotations from his writings will make it clear what he thought of government and property:⁹

The great and chief end, therefore, of men uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property; . . .

The great end of men's entering into society being the enjoyment of their properties in peace and safety, and the great instrument and means of that being the laws established in that society, the first and fundamental positive law of all commonwealths is the establishing of the legislative power, as the first and fundamental natural law which is to govern even the legislative. . . .

For the preservation of property being the end of government, and that for which men enter into society, it necessarily supposes and requires that the people should have property, . . .

But government, into whomsoever hands it is put, being as I have before showed, entrusted with this condition, and for this end, that men might have and secure their properties, . . .

Locke, however, was not blindly followed by the political leaders of the Revolutionary and constitutional era. Madison and Wilson have already been mentioned. There were others. George Mason, who was, according to his recent biographer, close to the political thinking of the Levelers and Locke, had parted company with the latter on the nature of civil society and government when he wrote the Virginia Declaration of Rights.¹⁰ John Adams, too, knew his Locke. He had also parted company with Locke when he prefaced the Massachusetts Bill of Rights with the declaration that:

The end of the institution, maintenance, and administration of government, is to secure the existence of the body-politic, to protect it, and to furnish the individuals who compose it with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights, and the blessings of life:

The writings of the framers and their contemporaries show they had not succumbed to the 18th century European "enlightened" view that a man's right to his property was unrestricted and that its protection was the chief end of a commonwealth. That was to come later, when the post-Civil War industrial revolution inspired

Carnegie's gospel of wealth. In the constitutional period, the social as well as the individual character of private property were recognized. And even though the right of association, especially in the form of workingmen's organization, was neglected, this right was not denied as it was by the leaders of the French Revolution.¹¹

The Importance of Property

Still, from the first hour of strain between the colonies and the British parliament, property was closely linked with the survival of liberty and man's other rights, and the fight to protect property appeared to many as a struggle to protect all rights. And the Lockean doctrine appealed to the colonists. It had a much wider appeal than in Great Britain where the land was possessed by a small group of landed aristocrats. If the main purpose of government was the protection of property, naturally only the property holders had any right to exercise political power. Such a view secured a monopoly on the government for the landed aristocracy, and that was what happened in Great Britain. But quite the contrary was true in the United States after the war of independence.

Nearly everyone was a property owner in the United States where property was better and more widely distributed than in any European country. And so it is very misleading to refer in unqualified terms to the non-property class and the "lower" class being unrepresented at the Federal Convention, for unless one has reference to the slaves, the non-property class was a very small minority and the "lower" class was really a property class. Nineteen out of every twenty supporters of the Revolution, according to a sound estimate, were farmers,—property men.¹² The number of small land holders increased rapidly during and immediately after the war from the sale of confiscated Loyalists' holdings whose large estates were as a rule divided among many, so that the farmer, not the business man nor the mechanic, was the average American citizen after independence had been won.¹³

The unsuccessful attempt to restrict the federal suffrage to property holders was based precisely on the fact that nearly everyone would be included. Two avowed champions of government by property holders, John Dickinson and Gouverneur Morris, argued strongly for this point, because, as the former remarked, "The great mass of our citizens is composed at this time of freeholders, and will be pleased with it."¹⁴ "Nine-tenths of the people," Morris added, "are at present freeholders, and these will certainly be pleased with it. As to merchants &c., if they have wealth, and value the right, they can acquire it. If not, they don't deserve it."¹⁵ But it would be well to note that these two men argued for a government of property holders from *political* not *economic* reasons. Such a government would be the "best guardians of liberty."¹⁶

⁸ Sir Frederick Pollock was surprised to learn that his friend Oliver Wendell Holmes, nearly eighty years old and seventeen years on the Supreme Court, had never read Locke's treatise on government and urged his friend to read it, for it was a "must" book. Mark DeWolfe Howe (ed.), *Holmes-Pollock Letters The Correspondence of Mr. Justice Holmes and Sir Frederick Pollock 1874-1932* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942), II, 22-23.

⁹ Everyman's Library edition (New York: E. P. Dutton & Sons, 1936), pp. 180, 183, 187, 188.

¹⁰ Helen Hill, *George Mason Constitutionalist* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938), p. 140-142.

¹¹ See "Decree for Abolishing the Industrial Corporations" of the Constituent Assembly, June 14, 1791, Frank M. Anderson, *The Constitutions and Other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France 1789-1901* (Minneapolis: The H. H. Wilson Co., 1904), pp. 43-45.

¹² Arthur M. Schlesinger, "What Then Is the American, This New Man?" *The American Historical Review*, XLVIII (January, 1943), 229.

¹³ Edward C. Kirkland, *A History of American Economic Life*, (New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1939), pp. 130, 135.

¹⁴ James Madison, *Journal of the Constitutional Convention*, edited by E. H. Scott (New York: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1893), p. 468.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 469.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 468.

To classify the advocates and the opponents of the Constitution on economic grounds is such an easy task for the teacher and so "modern" that the enthusiastic reception of this thesis is not surprising. But when one begins to consider the multitude of individuals and groups advocating or opposing the Constitution in open defiance of compelling economic interests, one wonders whether it is historical knowledge or an overpowering desire for the conclusion or a determination to be up to date that accounts for the acceptance of the doctrine. A few obvious difficulties offered by an alert classroom might be mentioned.

Character of the Framers

There is, first of all, the implication in this explanation of the framing of our Constitution that the members of the convention were not capable of rising above the demands of their own sordid interests,—and this ten years after the Declaration of Independence. Of course, this could be so. But I think most historians will agree with Professor Samuel E. Morison's description of the members as "an assembly of notables" with a fine grasp of political theory and the realities of government.¹⁷ These delegates were men of note in their communities not only on the score of their excellent intellects but also for their characters. "America has certainly upon this occasion drawn forth her first characters," remarked one delegate, George Mason, a wealthy planter who opposed the drafted Constitution. And as a group they did not betray themselves. James Madison knew them better than any one else and in his preface to his notes on the debates he tells us:¹⁸

I feel it a duty to express my profound and solemn conviction, derived from my intimate opportunity of observing and appreciating the views of the Convention, collectively and individually, that there never was an assembly of men, charged with a great and arduous trust, who were more pure in their motives, or more exclusively or anxiously devoted to the object committed to them, than were the members of the Federal Convention of 1787, to the object of devising and proposing a constitutional system which best supply the defects of that which it was to replace, and best secure the permanent liberty and happiness of their country. They were then, according to Madison, a group of men who were anxiously concerned, for reasons above suspicion, about the happiness and permanent liberty of the nation. Madison, at least, did not think the interests of speculators and property men dominated and determined the work of the convention.

James Madison is not an easy obstacle for the "economic" interpretators of the Constitution to hurdle, and accordingly his paramount influence in the making of the document has been either ignored or misrepresented. He was one of the Virginian gentry whose chief intellectual occupation was political speculation and he came from a state relatively free from the forces that were disturbing Massachusetts and other eastern states. He was a keen student of political science and the author of the plan that became the framework of the accepted Constitution. Convinced that no stable and durable government could be raised unless "it should rest on the solid foundation of the people themselves," the predominant influence of political ideas in his contribution to the Constitution appears unquestionable.¹⁹ Did he, de-

spite his intentions, draft a frame of government for the benefit of a class?

Professor Beard was, of course, fully aware of the importance of Madison's influence on the making of the Constitution. Since he was the father of the Constitution, he must have been a god-father of economic determinism in politics.²⁰ What could be more logical?

Madison was, indeed, concerned about the protection of man's right to property under the new government, for he knew that this right was necessary for the full, natural development of man in a free country. This was and is a sound political doctrine based on a sound view of man. Madison had also observed that property interests induced a variety, not a unity, of interests, and that care must be had to consider the interests of all groups and to prevent the majority group from benefiting at the expense of the minority groups. For, as he said; it is²¹

politic as well as just, that the interests and rights of every class should be duly represented and understood in the public councils. . . . The principle classes into which our citizens were divisible, were the landed, the commercial, and the manufacturing. The second and third class bear, as yet, a small proportion to the first. . . . It is particularly requisite, therefore, that the interests of one or two of them, should not be left entirely to the care or impartiality of the third.

If these obvious observations of Madison are a "masterly" affirmation of economic determinism in politics, then it would seem that one cannot mention the words "property" and "property interests" without being an economic determinist.

Madison certainly was for the protection of the right of possessing property, for he was convinced that "the freeholders of the country would be the safest depositories of republican liberty."²² He wanted a nation of families possessing the land they worked and from which they drew their daily subsistence. He wanted the interests of land owners to be the superior property interests of the nation. And although he was not unaware of the economic aspect of these measures he was more concerned with the political and social implications of property, for he knew that the healthy function of the family and the individual was bound up with the ownership of the land on which the family lived and worked and that without widespread ownership of land in the form of family homesteads there would be little stability within the political society. We are aware of that, today.²³ Still, Madison would not entrust the interests of the other property classes to the mercy of the landown-

Washington, April 16, 1878, *Letters and Other Writings of James Madison* (4 vols., New York: E. Worthington, 1884), I, pp. 287-292, in which Madison explains to his friend, two months before the date set for the convention, what he considers essentials for a new government. These essential features are political, not economic.

²⁰ Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*, p. 14-15. Madison was no economic determinist, despite the wishes of some. Read his "Notes of the Confederacy" where he makes it clear that people are not determined merely by their economic interests. *Letters of James Madison*, I, 325-328.

²¹ Madison, *Journal*, p. 440.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 470.

²³ Others had advocated views similar to Madison's without being accused of economic determinism. For instance, we read in the "Crisis of Christianity," a statement of the Catholic Bishops of the United States issued November 17, 1941: "His Holiness insists that, of all goods which can be held as private property, 'none is more conformable to nature than land.' The Holy Father lays stress on the social significance of widespread ownership of

¹⁷ Morison, *Sources and Documents*, Introduction, p. xli.

¹⁸ Madison, *Journal*, p. 51.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 80; read especially Madison's letter to George

ers nor would he limit the suffrage to freeholders. That would not be "politic and just."

The Small Farmer

Much is made of the contention that the small farmer-artisan class was voiceless at the constitutional convention. The constitution was the work of the wealthy and the conservatives. The facts and figures used to indicate who and how many voted in the selection of delegates to the federal and to the state ratifying conventions are far from satisfactory and certainly do not warrant the assumption that the results of the polls were "economically determined." A fine example of how far figures can be strained to support a conclusion in favor of the economic interpretation of the Constitution can be found in Professor Beard's remarks on the ratifying convention of Connecticut.²⁴ Public securities, we are told, were a "dynamic" factor in the ratification of the Constitution in this state, since we have discovered that 65 (just a majority) out of the 128 members in favor of adoption held public paper ranging from a few dollars to tens of thousands. We are not told how many had just a few dollars and how many tens of thousands; we are not told if any of the 40 members who voted against ratification held any securities,—that would not be so easy to explain. The whole supposition is that any one with a few dollars was thereby determined to vote for the new government. This is not a very pleasant view of human nature.

The delegates were the conservatives of 1786. But one should not forget that they were among the radicals of 1776, for the real conservatives had left the country during or shortly after the war, and in any European country of that day they would be ranked among the radicals. Why were they sent to Philadelphia? Was it because this group had a rigid control of the state legislatures? It does not seem so. The more conservative element in the states was disturbed with local conditions precisely because they were not in control and accordingly feared the excesses of the legislative bodies. And surely there would not have been so much difficulty over the ratification of the Constitution by the states, if they had such complete control. It would seem, then, that these "conservatives" were elected in some instances at least by the supposedly dangerous legislative bodies. The states did not have to send any delegates to Philadelphia; they could have, like Rhode Island, ignored the whole affair.

Why, then, were the small farmers and the artisans without representation? First, the two groups should not be, as they frequently are, considered jointly. The small farmer had the suffrage; the artisan, except in some cities, did not.²⁵ And there are some fairly sound reasons why small farmers were not sent to Philadel-

land in the form of the family homestead. To him, the function of the family as the root of a nation's greatness and power is bound up with family ownership of 'the holding on which it lives, and from which it draws all or part of its subsistence.' Without that 'stability which is rooted in its own holding,' the family cannot be the 'cell of society' which nature destined it to be."

²⁴ Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*, pp. 267-268.

²⁵ Mason remarked at the Convention that eight or nine states had extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders, and Nathaniel Gorham of Massachusetts added that mechanics voted in Boston, New York and Philadelphia. Madison, *Journal*,

phia. In the first place, he did not bother much about the exercise of the suffrage, although he demanded the right to exercise it.²⁶ But how many farmers, do you think, would have gone to Philadelphia during the late spring and summer of 1787? Such a trip would mean not only the neglect of his farm for one season, but the expenditure of much hard money. Mason, a rather wealthy man, found the journey a strain on his pocketbook.²⁷ Again, the social lines of colonial days were still strong. Deference was paid to wealth and station and the learned professions. There was a small, select group of men of prominence to whom all turned on occasions like the choice of delegates to important conventions. And finally, politically there was no great difference, no sharp and fundamental antagonism between the large and small land owners. The country in 1787 was conservative. Perhaps, the small farmer was far better represented than we suspect. He repeatedly honored the delegates with public positions after ratification, and the American farmer has usually a keen sense for the men who best represent his interests.

Economic Groups

There is, finally, the contention that the supporters and opponents of the proposed Constitution were divided into sharply fixed economic groups: large propertied men, creditors, speculators and the wealthy versus the small propertied men, debtors and the poor. There was a tendency among those of the same economic level to view the Constitution from the same angle, but this economic predilection was neither exclusive nor overmastering, as the evidence assures us. The reasons given by the opponents for their position varied; they varied with the sections and within the sections of the country. The same is true of the supporters, so that one hesitates to classify either of them into groups motivated by the same reason. It appears that the same economic motive helped to divide one group in this section, yet helped to unite a similar group in another section. There was, for instance, much opposition to the Constitution from the large propertied class of Virginia and New York; the western section of Virginia was largely in favor of the new government whereas it met with considerable opposition in the western section of Massachusetts.²⁸

It was precisely the variety of and the disparity between the objections of the opponents that worried James Madison during the trying days of ratification. He told Edmund Pendleton that:²⁹

The grounds of objection among the non-signing members of the Convention are by no means the same. The disapproving members who were absent, but who have since published their objections, differ irreconcilably from each of them. The writers against the Constitution are as little agreed with one another; and the principles which have been disclosed by the several minorities, where the Constitution has not been unanimously adopted, are as heterogeneous as can be imagined. That of Mas-

pp. 468, 472.

²⁶ Beard reminds us that many did not bother to exercise the privilege of the suffrage until the warm conflicts of the Jeffersonian period. Beard, *op. cit.*, p. 242. The 80% of eligible voters persuaded to vote during the bitter elections of 1875-1897 was considered extraordinary.

²⁷ Hill, *George Mason*, p. 186.

²⁸ Charles Warren, *The Making of the Constitution* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1929), 75-77. Warren points out many factors ignored by champions of the economic interpretation of the Constitution, cf. pp. 69-82.

²⁹ February 21, 1787, *Letters of James Madison*, I, 381.

sachusetts, as far as I can learn, was averse to any Government that deserved the name, and, it is certain, looked no farther than to reject the Constitution *in toto* and return home in triumph. The men of abilities, of property, of character, with every judge, lawyer of eminence, and the clergy of all sects, were, with scarce an exception, deserving of notice, as unanimous in that State as the same description of characters are divided and opposed to one another in Virginia.

The leaders of the opposition were not unknown, small propertied men (they were supposed to be voiceless), but political figures of the day, men of wealth and as a rule respected in their communities. Madison was astounded by their ability and respectability.³⁰ And what is of more importance these men of intelligence opposed the Constitution for political reasons. George Mason and Patrick Henry feared a strong federal government. Even money-minded individuals like Hancock and Clinton considered the state governments a sufficient protection of their property and political interests. Robert Yates and John Lansing, two New York delegates to the convention, urged the people of their state to reject the Constitution. They made no accusation of a conspiracy of wealth against the majority; rather they offer two political reasons both for their own disapproval of the completed document and for a rational rejection of it by the people: the convention lacked the legal power to frame such a government and a consolidated government was impracticable and contained a threat to the "civil liberties" of the people.³¹

Classification along rigid economic lines runs counter to the results of the conventions in the small states. Delaware, New Jersey and Georgia gave unanimous approval, while Maryland ratified with little opposition (63 to 11). These states had their share of small farmers, debtors and strong advocates of state independence. What happened to them? Were they silenced? There is no evidence to support such a statement. There were many sound reasons for supporting the new government which would outweigh the dictates of their economic interests. They, too, could easily have been of the same mind as James Madison who told a friend:³²

I have, for some time, been persuaded that the question on which the proposed Constitution must turn is the simple one, *whether the Union shall or shall not be continued*. There is, in my opinion, no middle ground to be taken. The opposition with some has disunion assuredly for its object, and with all for its real tendency.

Union—liberty and happiness through union—was the immediate objective of the great majority of the framers. This was a political problem; a solution primarily political was offered. Without any radical departure from pre-revolutionary thought, political ideas inherited from England and enriched by colonial experience were blended with consummate practical wisdom into a written constitution. They were mindful that they were proposing liberty and happiness through union to a nation that was property-minded because it was a nation of property-holders who had found protection of their personal and civil rights in the protection of their property. Like any political document it had its economic aspects

and appeal, yet the economic appeal did not determine the liberties and rights protected, the framework of government projected and the fundamental law incorporated in the Constitution. That was quite beyond the ability of a board of bank directors.

"Anti-Jesuit Law"

(Continued from page ten)

Time" also suggested to Puritan minds the need of taking practical steps to guard against Jesuit influence in New England. Thus the Puritan assumption that the Jesuit threat was real and constant received confirmation from the happenings in Maryland. Into the tense atmosphere created by a sharpened anti-Catholicism came the report of a Jesuit on the Kennebec, in English territory. The result, the law of 1647, is easily explicable; some of the impetus to anti-Catholic legislation came from the violence in Maryland, and the journey of Druilletes served as the precipitating occasion.

Editorial

(Continued from page eight)

another which AST practice should have taught. The reference is to the insistence on the study of geography. For a long time we historians have had ample evidence that the knowledge of geography acquired in elementary school by our pupils is wholly and distressingly inadequate. We have done what we could to remedy the situation in our own classes and, perhaps, have tried to convince administrators that consideration should be given to this study on the secondary and the college level. In this last our best efforts were probably but very meagerly rewarded. Geography, in the popular mind and even, at times, in the administrative mind, continued to be regarded as a subject for the grades, one not worthy of the youthful and the maturing student.

The war has helped to change this frame of mind, not only by the fact that we have had to pull out the maps in order to follow its progress, but also because of both Army and Navy stress on the subject in training programs. Let us strike while the iron is hot and help bring geography into a well deserved place of honor in post-elementary curricula. We historians stand to profit by such an addition. Space as well as time play their roles in our subject-matter. When maps cease to be just pieces of brightly colored paper to our students, but really tell a live story, then the story which we have to tell about dead men will have that added element of life. We can help the geographer and he can return our services in kind.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY SERIES

published by

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN

GREEK AND ROMAN HISTORY

by Richard L. Porter, S.J. M.A.

MEDIEVAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

by John J. Campbell, S.J.

³⁰ Madison to Jefferson, December 9, 1787, *ibid.*, I, 362-367; Warren, *op. cit.*, 751-752.

³¹ Henry S. Commager, *Documents of American History* (New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1940), I, 149-150.

³² Madison to Edmund Pendleton, February 21, 1788, *Letters of James Madison*, I, 381. Beard in *The Republic*, pp. 80-81, stresses this motive of the framers.

Italian Unification

(Continued from page fourteen)

previous qualifications do not seriously weaken the undoubted force of the above quotation; so that we must say that, until the end of June at least, Daniel substantially approved of the policy of the Unionists in the South.²³

The People's Attitude

It is, however, in August, 1860, just before Garibaldi's invasion of Naples, that Daniel presents his most striking piece of information concerning the real attitude of the people of Sicily and Naples.²⁴

After establishing his position in Sicily in the mid-summer of 1860, the leader of The Thousand delayed, much to the annoyance of the more radical, his attack on the Neapolitan mainland. The American minister explains the reason for this hesitation: Garibaldi has found that the majority of the people of Sicily do not wish the revolution, and he fears that the Neapolitans are even less enthusiastic; and being an honest man, he pauses in uncertainty.²⁵

This testimony would seem to be important. The liberal historians have insisted that the unification of Italy was achieved with the hearty approbation and consent of the people.²⁶ Daniel tells us that "the mass, at least in Sicily, were either indifferent or on the other side."²⁷ Bolton King admits that there was a subsequent falling off in the Sicilians' revolutionary fever, but nowhere suggests that they wished to remain under Bourbon rule.²⁸ Daniel, on the contrary, says of the peasants, that "if they fight at all, it will be on the side of the king."²⁹ This testimony may well give pause to over-enthusiastic apologists for the Italian Revolution.

²⁴ The Unionists laid much stress on the method of plebiscite, which, they declared, proved the desire of the various populations of Italy for annexation to Piedmont. The question of Italian plebiscites in general has been treated by Daniel in a despatch of April, 1860. He feels that they are "of little worth considered as true expressions of the popular will." Government pressure of various kinds nullifies the freedom of the voter. "It is certain," says the American minister, "that Napoleon or Cavour can have a popular vote of any description that they may desire; for they have not only a machinery but a material to work on which is unknown in England or in the United States, the people in France and Italy being habitually and generally afraid of their governments, and looking on all opposition to them on such occasions as a rashness and imprudence certain to secure for the individuals indulging in it a long series of ills." (*Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 144, April 17, 1860).

²⁵ "Through one of his (Garibaldi's) intimate friends . . . I gained the explanation of his unaccustomed vacillation. Garibaldi is an honest man who sincerely believed that the cause he embraced was that of the people. But when he got to Sicily he found that all the noise was made by a few hundred; the mass was either indifferent or on the other side. Now that he has finished with Sicily, he knows that the Neapolitans are even less with him than were the Sicilians. As for the peasants, they are all unquestionably against him; they are reactionists (sic); if they fight at all, it will be on the side of the king . . . Garibaldi knows well that if the government of Naples is overturned, it must be by his own arms and not by the will of the Neapolitan nation; and in this position he hesitates" (*Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 161, Aug. 14, 1860).

²⁶ Vide A. Gori, *II Risorg. Ital.*, "From the cooperation, discordant as to the means, but unanimous as to the supreme final objective, . . . the new kingdom was born" (p. 360).

²⁷ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 161, Aug. 14, 1860.

²⁸ King, *A History of Italian Unity*, Vol. ii, pp. 145-147. King admits the Sicilians' disinclination for unification, but insists that they wished separation from the Bourbon dynasty.

²⁹ Daniel, *des. cit.* Shortly before, Daniel had enlarged on this

It is fitting to add here the observations of J. R. Chandler, the American minister at Naples at this time. Writing five weeks after Daniel's despatch of August 14, he notes a similar apathy on the part of the Sicilians towards their liberators. The unstable character of this people, he says, is beginning to manifest itself. Garibaldi, who, two weeks since, was received with cries of joy (a fact evidently unknown to Daniel) begins to hear murmurings of discontent, and to comprehend something of treacherous machinations against himself.³⁰

Garibaldi, however, succeeded in overcoming his scruples—and Naples.³¹ But Daniel, in November, 1860, observes that Naples is far from being contented with her new regime, and on the other hand, Victor Emmanuel, succeeding Garibaldi, "is said to be very sick of his new subjects."³² Significantly, perhaps, the new king's sojourn at Naples, originally intended to last throughout the winter, is to be suddenly terminated within three weeks.³³

Daniel concludes this part of his testimony with a condemnation of the seizure of Sicily from the standpoint of international law. He declares that he has "never seen and scarcely ever heard of an instance in which the ordinary rules of international law were so openly set at naught."³⁴ Again, he says that Garibaldi's

testimony, with special reference to the inhabitants of the mainland: "But it may well be doubted whether the Neapolitans themselves are dissatisfied with the present rule of the Bourbons . . . Even the warmest advocates of the revolution in this kingdom, Piedmont, seem disposed to admit that if a free popular vote was taken at this moment, mid-June, 1860, to decide the question, the people of Naples would retain their ancient dynasty. In a conversation with Garibaldi a short time previous to his departure I expressed this opinion to him and he reluctantly assented, but added with much simple faith that, 'Liberty itself must sometimes be forced on the people for their future good'" (*Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 153, June 19, 1860.) (italics inserted).

³⁰ *Italy*, Vol. III, *Two Sicilies*, Chandler, No. 66, Sept. 22, 1860.

³¹ "The vote annexing the Two Sicilies and the Papal Legations to his (Victor Emmanuel's) dominions has been nearly unanimous in his favor, and though reactionary movements have been made by the uncultivated peasantry [who, he remarked in passing, constituted the vast majority of the kingdom] in various parts of the Neapolitan kingdom, and though its legitimate monarch still holds out at Gaeta, it is impossible not to regard him (Victor Emmanuel) as the actual and future sovereign of the country" (*Italy*, Vol. VII, No. 176, Nov. 13, 1860).

³² *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 178, Nov. 27, 1860.

³³ *Ibid.* The reasons for this discontent of the Two Sicilies are indicated in more than one publication of the period. Note the following typical extracts:—

"Neapolitans! With the annexation of our country to Piedmont our national independence is lost, and we are reduced to the status of a distant and abandoned province of Piedmont . . . Let there indeed be a single pact and a single faith for all Italy; but let us not cede, in heaven's name, our country!" (Salvatore Cognetti Giampaolo, *Napoli e Sicilia nel 1860*, Naples, Tip. Cav. Gaetano Nobile, 1860, pp. 16-17.) From *ibid.* (p. 24): "The people of Italy have wished to be free, and they are free. But Italian nationality has constituted itself by means of an impolitic act of aggression and by despoiling Francesco II of his throne. 'Re costituzionale' in Italy . . . our people do not wish it . . . The other Powers cannot permit it, because . . . thus the act of an individual would absurdly prevail over the right of nationality." Beltrani Morello (*Sull'annessione*, Naples, Tipo. Francesco Lao, 1860, pp. 11-12) argues for the independence of Sicily and her separation from Naples, but opposes annexation to Piedmont. He urges a federative system for Italy, and fears the results of a unitary government. The system of local autonomy, he feels, is dictated by Italian history.

³⁴ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 150, June 4, 1860.

act is one of those which can be justified only by success; judged by the normal law of nations, it is impossible to defend it.³⁵

A few weeks later he is even more explicit. However bad the former government may have been, and however indisputable the right of revolution, he declares that it is certain that all international law has been violated by this annexation. France and England have never ceased to rail against the United States for its methods of acquiring territory in the New World; yet both these governments have encouraged, connived at, and almost openly assisted the expedition of Garibaldi. This fact reveals the insincerity and hypocrisy of their denunciations of "similar but much less marked and distinct" undertakings on the American continent.³⁶

In regard to the attack on Naples, Daniel does not

say much, apart from what has been already mentioned. It seems likely, however, that his view of the subjugation of the mainland would not differ materially from his opinion of the conquest of the island part of the kingdom, since the two acts did not differ essentially in character.

These specimens of American testimony illustrate the need for a re-examination of the problem of Italian unification with greater attention to the Conservative case. It is not impossible that such a study would throw much light on the present problem of re-making an Italy which, apparently, never was placed on firm national foundations.

³⁵ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 151, June 12, 1860.

³⁶ *Italy*, Vol. VII, Daniel, No. 156, July 3, 1860.

Recent Books In Review

EUROPEAN HISTORY

A Judgment of the Old Regime, by Paul H. Beik. New York. Columbia University Press. 1944. pp. 290. \$3.00

At the close of the Seven Years' War in 1763 Louis XV issued an invitation to the parlements of France to collaborate in reforming finances. They were to collect information on conditions within their respective districts and send it, together with suggestions for reform, to the king. Few parlements seem to have acted seriously on the king's invitation.

But the parlement of Provence did. Between 1763 and 1767 the magistrates filled fourteen manuscript volumes with information and opinions on reform in France. Their original task of suggesting financial reform led them to study political and social conditions in general, with which they filled their fourteen volumes. This work forms part of the famous Seligman Collection at Columbia University and was considered by the late Professor Seligman to be "by all odds the fullest statement and discussion of the French revenues in existence."

Dr. Beik analyzes this work and brings it to the public in readable form for the first time, in his *Judgment of the Old Regime*. This is a solid, well-balanced critical study that adds to the historian's information on conditions in the Old Regime. It reveals nothing which is startlingly new, and no serious revision of opinion on the Old Regime will result from this study. But it does throw some new light on conditions between 1763 and 1789. From many such studies as this will come a more complete picture of France before the revolution.

The reader should remember, however, that Provence was by no means a typical province of France. It had its peculiar institutions and way of life which before the revolution had largely resisted absorption into France. This is a *Judgment of the Old Regime*, then, by the magistrates of Provence who were more interested in Provence than in France. It is a judgment, though, with which teachers and students of French history should be acquainted—a judgment which Dr. Beik organizes into studies of population and statesmanship, agriculture, industry, commerce, money, and a new financial system.

THOMAS P. NEILL

France Reviews Its Revolutionary Origins, by Paul Farmer. New York. Columbia University Press. 1944. pp. vi + 145. \$2.25

This account of works by Frenchmen on the French Revolution is a study of "history as present politics." The author attempts to show the correlation between social and political conditions in France since 1815 on the one hand and attitudes toward the revolution on the other. Wisely the author seeks to relate, not so much the author of each work, as its reading public to particular social and political groupings in France at the time each work appeared.

The book, however, is valuable not so much for the thesis it seeks to prove as for providing a handy bibliographical study on the revolution. Only the most important French authors are treated, but it is around these men that have been formed the various "schools" on the revolution to which all authors adhere in some fashion or other. Farmer gives a succinct account, for example, of the principle difference between the Taine and Au-

lard schools; or again, he shows how Mathiez modified Aulard's work and how Madelin modified the thesis of Taine. It is as this kind of a study that the book is most useful.

The thesis itself, that "historical study . . . is an inseparable part of the life of its times," hardly needs proving. But in his short volume the author does satisfy the reader that this general statement applies with greater force to the history of the French Revolution than it does to other subjects. Because modern Western ideology and Western institutions derive largely from the French Revolution, Western men have lined up for or against the revolution according to their approval or disapproval of this ideology and these institutions. Farmer's volume shows who is on which side—and to some extent why.

THOMAS P. NEILL

A Short History of France, by Sir John A. R. Marriott. New York. Oxford University Press. 1944. pp. 291. \$2.75

The purpose of the *Short History*, as set down by the author in his preface, is to sketch the development of France, "the making of the French Nation-state." Perhaps the phrase might better read, "the un-making of France." Throughout the book the author implies that what France needed all along was what the Liberals of the 19th and 20th Century gave her. Whereas, in reality, it is for the sole purpose of removing such debris left by the death-dealing clutches of Liberalism in France that the whole world has gone to war.

The author has failed to see the French people as they are in his political interpretation of their history. He gives no reason for his complete neglect of their real needs, the real civilization that was the lost cause for the last hundred years in France. Sir John puts the *Philosophes*, and Jean Jacques Rousseau as prophets born before their time. Was that what France needed in the eighteenth century? If the Constitution of 1875, and such leaders as Grevy and Jules Ferry in the last century, and Briand and Leon Blum in more recent times, gave France what she needed, then the war we are waging today is in vain.

The materials the author has on hand in the book are often excellent; it is too bad that such a timely book as a *Short History of France* should be marred by a false interpretation of the true France and a lack of precision in political details of its history. In begging pardon for a shortage of reference books and a complete bibliography of first-hand sources, the author does not remove the charge of failure to complete the picture of the politics in France. Is the liberal history of France to remain the only history? If the anti-clericals alone are to be trusted, and all ultra-montaine writings to be discarded, then where are we to find an unbiased insight into the people of France? In a short history of a people we would prefer more exactness and definitiveness.

In the order of presentation, *The Short History* is somewhat confusing. The details are more outstanding than the points to be garnered from them.

R. NEENAN

Anglo-Saxon England, by F. M. Stenton. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1943. pp. 748. \$7.50

The political social, and literary events that fall between the years 550 and 1087 form the subject matter of this most interest-

ing, and, from a literary standpoint, well balanced volume. The data has been carefully gathered, sifted, and presented in an unornamented yet not unimaginative manner.

In treating the political history of the period, the central interest is the evolution of a successful and effective monarchy in England. This monarchy over-rode all barriers of race and custom which separated the English people themselves, separated them from the Scandinavian colonists of the North and East, and culminated with William the Conqueror who in twenty years transformed this immemorial Germanic kingship into a pattern of feudal sovereignty. The Chapter on the Anglo-Norman state forms the epilogue to the book.

The social aspect of early English history deals with the structure of early English society, and gives something of a history of the religion of the people. The social order of sixth and seventh century England was complicated by reason of the large number of nobles, lords, landowners, and free peasants. It is significant that already in these early years the aristocratic element was important in the social order of England, even though the free peasant formed the basis of society. Division of land, agricultural system, rent, and fyrd-service are some of the topics treated in the chapter on the structure of English society.

The most interesting subject in the book is the author's treatment of the conversion of the English peoples. After a brief explanation of the paganism of these early years, the author treats of the coming of the missionaries to England. He is careful to note that even though Irish monks were said to have come to England, their work was confined to the northern parts of Britain. There is no record of an Irish missionary earlier than the coming of Augustine. This makes the work of Augustine all the more important and more difficult because heathenism was rooted in the very soil by the practice of generations. The author likewise recalls that in the late sixth century the future of the Roman See was uncertain, because it was dependent on the eastern empire and thus was threatened with imminent danger from the new Lombard power in Italy. All monks and priests, therefore, were needed on the continent, and it was not until 596 that Augustine of Canterbury led the mission to Britain. The early trials and dangers of the missionaries, the disappointments, the encouragement from Rome, and the final establishment of a Bishopric show the history of the Catholic Church in early England. The author does not give sufficient credit to the work of Augustine. Although he readily admits that Augustine's task was filled with difficulties, yet according to Stenton, Augustine does not deserve a high place as a missionary. Granting that Augustine was no Willibrord or Boniface, his association with the great historical movement of the coming of the missionaries is more than an accident. The mere fact that he established something permanent is sufficient to give him a place in History. It was not until after 654, when militant heathenism was declining, that England began to settle down, and take time for producing books, creating libraries, and cultivating learning.

In connection with English letters, such men as Theodore, Hadrian, Aldhelm, Bede, Gildas, and Alcuin come into prominence. The author's treatment of these and other scholars is fair and well balanced. He is willing to give credit where credit is due, pointing out at the same time some of the defects of these men, especially from the historical view point. This fairness certainly is to his credit, because other writers have not been so objective in their treatment of an era that was so Catholic.

The book is easy to read, so easy in fact, that many times one slips along at a good rate, passing over much of the meat that is contained in the pages that pass by. The volume is a good example of how scholarship and research can be brought out in a pleasant and interesting manner. It is a fine contribution to the limited number of books that deal with the early history of England, and is well deserving of a place beside the other books in the *Oxford History of England* series.

ANTHONY J. BRENNER

From Despotism to Revolution 1763-1789, by Leo Gershey. New York. Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1944. pp. xvi 355. \$4.00

Professor Gershey's book is the eighth volume of the twenty planned to appear in the "Rise of Modern Europe" series edited by Professor William L. Langer. It covers that period in European history known as the "Enlightenment" or the "Age of the Benevolent Despots," and bridges the gap between Walter Dorn's *Competition for Empire 1740-1763* and Crane Brinton's *Decade of Revolution 1789-1799*.

This book offers the student of European history two principal features not to be found in earlier works on the same period. The first—and most valuable—is a comprehensive critical bibliography which offers an evaluation of both primary sources and

critical works on the period. The second feature is the European, as distinguished from the Gallocentric, treatment of the "Age of Enlightenment."

Gershey endeavors to follow the European point of view adopted for the entire "Rise of Modern Europe" series. His work therefore gives attention to such usually neglected persons as Gustavus III of Sweden, Leopold of Tuscany and Charles III of Spain. Such a treatment of the period differs from most others in that it views the Enlightenment as something more than the prelude to inevitable revolution.

The book suffers from Gershey's failure to follow the advice of his former instructor, Carl Becker, to enter the "climate of opinion" in things philosophical and theological. He is too good a historian to be taken in by the rantings of a Voltaire or a Diderot. And he is too objective a historian to be consciously intolerant. But he does not understand the teaching of the Church universal, nor even of Church defenders in the middle eighteenth century. A good corrective to be read with Gershey's book is R. R. Palmer's scholarly *Catholics and Unbelievers in Eighteenth Century France*.

THOMAS P. NEILL

AMERICAN HISTORY

Forman's OUR REPUBLIC, revised and enlarged by Fremont P. Wirth. New York. D. Appleton-Century Company. 1944. pp. xvi + 951. \$4.00

As the title indicates, this book emphasizes the growth, development, and rise of American civilization after the War of Independence up to and including part of World War II. Consequently, the treatment of colonial American history is rather brief, but the survey is clear and touches upon all the important events of our nation's infancy. The chapter, "A Survey of the Nation in 1783," is also representative of good selection of details which promote interest as well as a knowledge of early American life.

The plan of the book itself is conducive to inspiring interest and further reading about any given subject. The latter is suggested by the "References for Special Topics" appended to every chapter and a list of the various books cited which is found at the end of the book. The former is achieved by giving, let us say, an economic development of a given period, usually about ten years, in one chapter, and in the succeeding chapter treating the same period from the viewpoint of governmental activities and political happenings. This, however, is done in such a way that there is only an accidental repetition of any event, and the combined treatment dove-tails into a clear, comprehensive, and, almost consistently, into an unbiased picture of our nation's history.

Convenient maps and illustrations, showing various growths and developments of our nation at different periods, inserted throughout the book, augment the interest and the clarity of the subjects under discussion.

Special features of the book are occasional "Notes and Chronology." This matter is indexed but does not include any dates given or subjects treated in the main body of the text. The Constitution of the United States, appended to the book, is another noteworthy feature which helps to recommend the text for classroom use. In almost every "References for Special Topics" are included one or more historical fiction works, and scholarly accounts of many aspects of our history.

In our opinion, *Our Republic* recommends itself as a classroom text book both for the teacher as well as for the student.

WILLIAM H. STEINER

Monetary and Banking Theories of Jacksonian Democracy, by Sister M. Grace Madeline. Philadelphia. The Dolphin Press. 1943. pp. xi 186

The purpose of this book is "to examine in detail the monetary and banking theories of Jacksonian Democracy and to trace the progress of events which exercised so potent an influence in shaping the American financial system during the period which extends roughly from 1826 to 1842."

It fulfills its purpose very satisfactorily.

The author's method is strictly objective. She relates the facts as they happened, and in this setting allows contemporaries to make their comments and expound their theories. This is done either by direct quotation or, more frequently, by a well annotated synopsis of their arguments. She imposes no conclusions of her own upon the reader. The few comments which she makes as well as the manner in which she treats her material reveal a clear appreciation of economic and financial principles.

This taciturnity seems to be at once the strength and weakness of her work. It makes the books extremely interesting to one who merely wants to know the facts and is equipped to appraise

them in the light of economic principles; but to one not so equipped, the book is likely to be rather dry, if not unintelligible. Her failure to make more extensive comments may limit the usefulness of her work, but it does not furnish grounds for just complaints. We have no right to expect the author to supplement her work with a treatise on economic analysis.

The enthusiast might be disappointed with the work on another score. He might wish the author had queried more deeply into the causes of the events related. But, again, such a pursuit would have led the author far beyond the admitted scope of her work. To confine herself to the "monetary and banking theories of Jacksonian Democracy" was to limit her work; but it is a limitation well advertised in the title.

Rather than criticism for what she did not do, the student of history and economics owes Sister Madeliene a debt of appreciation and gratitude for research and for the intelligent accumulation of historical facts upon this very important phase of our financial and political history. That many hours of work were required is evinced by the extensive annotations; and the noteworthy bibliography bears witness to the thoroughness with which it was done.

CLETUS HEALY

Canada After the War, edited by Alexander Brady and F. R. Scott. Toronto. Macmillan Publishing Company. 1944. pp. 348. \$3.25

One of several thoughtful books sponsored by the Canadian Institute on International Affairs, *Canada After the War* offers ten papers by leading Canadian scholars on socio-political and economic aspects of Canada's post-war future. The student of Canadian affairs will find this quite provocative of thought, as will students of U. S. problems, which in many ways are similar to those of our neighbor.

The first five chapters are given to a discussion of social and political policies. An honest approach is made to the difficult questions of Canada's national policy, improvement in her parliamentary system, the need for rewriting the Constitution (the present one, a compilation of statutes included under the British North American Act, does not even mention the name of the country!), the social responsibilities of government, and, finally, Canada's place in international society.

A second series of five chapters treats of economic policies. The writers discuss the implications of full employment, organization of an international economic society, the control of exchange, the place of Canadian agriculture, and the establishment of a definite destination for Canadian industry.

The sincere appraisal of subjects treated, especially those in the first half of the book, will appeal to all. The willingness of the writers to suggest improvements, mostly changes from over-individualism and the laissez-faire policy, is an indication of their open-eyed modernity. While references to Quebec were usually quite fair, the book might have been bettered had one of the contributors been from a French group. Summarily, the Canadian is given food for thought on the future of the land; the American reader has the chance of knowing the nation to the north a little better, and also of viewing problems, very intimately connected with the United States, in the objective light of another land's sun.

JOSEPH B. SCHUYLER

The Economic Thought of Woodrow Wilson, by William Diamond. Baltimore. The Johns Hopkins Press. pp. 210. \$2.50

In this volume the author has clearly set forth the place of Wilson in his own times and has evaluated his contributions to contemporary ideas. The work of collecting and collating the many facts gathered from manuscripts and documents is enhanced by the clarity and fluency of presentation.

The one idea that dominated Wilson's thoughts on society and government was the idea of evolution and all its organismic corollaries. In liberal education he saw a technique for avoiding revolutionary agitation. In scientific education he found over-emphasis upon analytical reasoning, doubt and suspicion of the past. "Science has bred in us a spirit of experiment and contempt for the past;" it has made men "believe in the present and in the future more than in the past." "I should tremble," he added, "to see social reform led by men who had breathed in this atmosphere." Habit, tradition, heritage, and order were keywords and bywords in Wilson's writings and lectures.

Wilson has been misunderstood, misquoted, and misrepresented, maliciously by some, honestly by others. This book will help to clarify the thought of "a man," to quote Mr. Diamond, "who faced the future with his mind set, rather than made flexible, by the past. His domestic policy was an effort to recreate the condi-

tions of competitive capitalism, and his thought on international peace revolved around a faith in the harmonies of competition and the wisdom of depending upon the law of comparative advantage."

The most enlightening chapter of the book is the sixth, entitled *The New World Order*. Appearing as it does in the time of the present war, its interest is heightened.

FRANCIS N. CURRAN

CHURCH HISTORY

Carmelite and Poet, by Robert Sencourt. New York.

The Macmillan Company. 1944. pp. 230. \$3.00

It is not too frequently that we read a biography of a saint which is the result of serious historical research. Even in these "enlightened" days, many are the insipidly pious lives which clutter the shelves of catholic libraries. *Carmelite and Poet*, a framed portrait of St. John of the Cross, is refreshing because it is serious and objective.

The book is a literary life of a literary saint. John of the Cross is not only a great saint and the supreme doctor of the mystical ways; he is also an artist, the poet of divine love. Mr. Sencourt succeeds in giving us a profound understanding and a sincere admiration for this ardent lover of God. And what is truly a feat, Mr. Sencourt manages to be delightfully interesting, for he is not only a serious historian but a charming writer as well, who is able to bring us in intimate contact with John and his times.

There are two points which do not seem to me in keeping with the excellent character of the book. The first is a total lack of understanding of the great Scholastics of the Middle Ages. St. Thomas of Aquin, we are told, "taught that the intellect perceived a universal as the reality" (p. 20). This is exactly what Thomas formally denies. After this curious remark, Mr. Sencourt dismisses the Angelic Doctor rather summarily, for Thomas after all "never proved his case in such a way as to create general conviction" (ibid.). How could he, since he never taught such an absurd doctrine? From there Mr. Sencourt goes to the Spanish Renaissance, and gives the reader to understand that the theological authors of that period, especially the Carmelites went so much more deeply and completely in their search of truth than the Medievalists. I admit that I am a little confused by this.

Another point. Mr. Sencourt seems much impressed by the Spanish culture of the late Renaissance, asserting that this is one of the important moments in the history of *Christian* civilization. Nevertheless, he paints a harrowing picture of a Spain rotten to the core, where pride and hatred, the great sins, ruled supreme even in the hearts of highly respected ecclesiastics, who thought nothing of falsifying important documents and sending their best friends, even their own relatives, to unspeakable tortures and a shameful death, in order that they might gain power in the Church and State. Justice appears to have been a mere name, barbarous cruelty a matter of course, mercy or even ordinary pity absolutely unknown in the hearts of these *Christian* gentlemen. I confess I find it difficult to reconcile this picture with the praise given to the *Christian* culture of the Spanish Renaissance.

But these are small blemishes. *Carmelite and Poet* is an important book.

HENRI RENARD

Thomas Francis Meehan, by Sister M. Natalena Farrell. New York. The United States Catholic Historical Society. 1944. pp. 139

All Catholics, especially laymen, and more particularly historians and journalists, will be inspired and encouraged by this monograph on Thomas Francis Meehan (1854-1942). Although he was not widely known, his defense and promulgation of Catholic thought and the Catholic way of life through his untiring efforts in the field of journalism rank him as one of the most important Catholic laymen of our times.

Born in Brooklyn, Thomas Francis Meehan was first associated with his father on the staff of the *Irish American*, and later served as a reporter and correspondent for some of the leading New York and Brooklyn newspapers. His literary talents as well as his ardent Catholicism were recognized when he was chosen editorial manager for the compilation of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* in 1905. A few years later he was prevailed upon to become editorial assistant to the staff of the newly-founded *America*, a position which he filled during the last thirty-three years of his life.

It was due to him as an influential member of the United States Catholic Historical Society that much valuable Catholic historical source material was preserved in the *Records and Studies*. Students and professional historians continually sought his advice in their problems of historical research.

His acquaintances were many (he used to boast that he had talked to every Bishop of New York) and his personal experiences were legion—but with his death all this information was lost, for Thomas Meehan never could be prevailed upon to write his autobiography.

The author has portrayed the life of Thomas Meehan well. Clarity of style and a fine selection of excerpts from Meehan's writings make the monograph lively and enjoyable reading.

F. STANTON

American Catholic Opinion in the Slavery Controversy, by Madeline Hooke Rice. New York. Columbia University Press. 1944. pp. 177. \$2.50

In this book the author shows the position of the Catholic Church in America on the slavery question. After giving a general conspectus of the Church's attitude, she points out the differences of opinion between Catholics in the North and in the South.

It is a thorough inquiry; this is attested by the numerous references and a bibliography of some three hundred sources. The author draws no definite conclusions, but merely approaches the question by endeavoring to point out the predominating sentiments in cities, states, and sections of our nation. This objectivity, in particular, is a commendable feature.

The book is easy to read. Students of history would do well to fill out their picture of this period of our history by going through its pages. It is an excellent consideration of so weighty an element as Catholic opinion, a characteristic not to be found in most historical works.

E. J. CZARNECKI

History of the Archdiocese of Boston, 1604-1943, by Robert H. Lord, John Sexton and Edward T. Harrington. New York. Sheed & Ward. 1944. 3 vol. pp. xx + 812, 766, 808. \$15.00

If size is any index of a monumental work, the present history of the Boston Archdiocese must be ranked among the monumental ecclesiastical writings of this country. In addition to merebulk, however, the three authors give evidence of painstaking, exactly honest, historical workmanship. Any future student of American Catholic history will be indebted for the excellent collection of materials and careful ordering of them to be found in this book.

The official life spans of Boston's five bishops provide convenient divisions for the book. Volume I covers the colonial and revolutionary periods to 1788, and the establishment of the Church, and of the diocese under Bishop Cheverus, to 1825. Many pages of these two sections, ascribed to Doctor Sexton, are among the best in the book. Of importance, in addition to the portrayal of the Puritan background, is the light shed on the character of Father Matignon, equally a *founding father* with Bishop Cheverus.

Volume II covers the episcopates of Benedict Fenwick, S.J., and John Bernard Fitzpatrick. Under Fenwick, Boston received its first taste of Catholic higher education, and under him it suffered some of its most violent persecutions, which culminated in the burning of the Charlestown convent, despite the valiant efforts of Mother St. George, and the outbreak of Native Americanism. Bishop Fitzpatrick continued the work of organization, a work especially needed in the face of the Irish influx after the 'year of the *Black Potato*.'

Eighty years of steady growth, consolidation, and triumph, under two eminent prelates, Archbishop Williams and William Cardinal O'Connell, form the story of the last volume. Though the history of the period from 1910 on is often merely chronicle of churches built, institutions dedicated to charitable services, and episcopal activities, the first section has an excellent treatment of questions agitated in that important last quarter of the nineteenth century. Archbishop Williams, although he never allowed himself to become too intimate with any special group in the hierarchy of the U. S., was in contact with members of both "liberal" and "conservative" parties. His correspondence and personal notes afford a fairly objective view of several points at issue. For instance, while at first he seemingly approved of Bishop Ireland's actions in the School Controversy, Williams afterwards took the attitude adopted by Rome and Cardinal Satolli, which resulted in the sudden removal of Monsignor D. J. O'Connell from the rectorate of the American College, and the equally abrupt displacement of Bishop Keane from that of the Catholic University, a few years after the *Tolerari Potest* letter. The incident is carefully recorded and its treatment is a balance between the Zwierlein and Wills accounts of the Rochester and Baltimore incumbents of the era.

Praise should be high for this book. It covers the phenomenal growth of one of the strongest dioceses in the world, and yet manages to include many of the finer details of its history. In achieving this goal, the work suffers here and there from oversimplification or too lengthy cataloguing. But it remains a definite contribution to the annals of American Catholic history.

DONALD CAMPION

White Smoke Over the Vatican, by Don Sharkey. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Company. 1944. pp. 172. \$2.00

This is a useful book. Written by a journalist in newspaper style, *White Smoke Over the Vatican* wins no prizes for its literary quality. In fact, the style is frequently too youthful. However, its value for readers of every class rests securely on the brilliant and extensive reporting of Mr. Sharkey.

While the author admits to some superficiality, as a matter of fact the work shows much study and coordinated research. And despite large print, a newsy style, and relatively few pages, there is a great deal of information. The story deals with every place, office, and major activity connected with Vatican City. There are excellent factual descriptions of the buildings, grounds, and modern installations. Some forty-five well-written pages are given to St. Peter's—an admittedly insufficient account, but one that is surprisingly satisfactory. Chapters are devoted to the Papal Palace, the Vatican's library, and its art treasures.

Of particular interest, and well composed, are the brief treatments of the relations between the Vatican and the United States, the Vatican's history, its relations with Italy and, of course, Mussolini. An adequate map and some fifty illustrations enhance the value of the book. The reviewer is most sincere in recommending it for the enjoyable and profitable reading of the general public, and particularly of teachers and students of modern and church history.

JOSEPH B. SCHUYLER

Saving Angel, by T. Lawrason Riggs. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Company. 1944. pp. 98. \$1.75

Despite all that has been written concerning Joan of Arc, there still remains one highly controverted point of her brief career which raises a question in the mind of every reader,—what was the nature of Joan's relations with the authority and discipline of the Church. This is the question *Saving Angel* proposes to discuss.

In his treatment the author adheres closely to the particular phase of Joan's life with which he is concerned. In judging his work this should be borne in mind. His is an objective study of the trials and plots culminating in her condemnation and execution, and of the rehabilitation process which, twenty-five years after her death, exonerated her from all charges of heresy.

The critical evaluation of court proceedings and the careful weighing of documentary evidence involved in a work of this sort oftentimes results in a dry and tiresome discussion of records and written testimonies and the inclusion of lengthy, verbose quotations. For the most part, Fr. Riggs avoids these pitfalls. Consequently *Saving Angel* is both convincing and, for a book of its kind, interesting. The author establishes his point; namely, that Joan was not guilty of heresy, that the ecclesiastical court which condemned her was neither legally constituted nor justly administered, and that the Church itself acknowledged her innocence in an official procedure some years after her death. In addition he imparts an increased appreciation for the simple and appealing figure of the Maid of Orleans.

W. V. STAUDER

Austrian Aid to American Catholics, 1830-1860, by Reverend B. J. Blied. Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 1944. pp. 205. \$2.50

The Reverend B. J. Blied has investigated this subject at great length and has written a scholarly book, which is a contribution to the history of the Catholic Church in America.

He shows the relationship between America and Austria during the period 1830-1860, and in particular points out how Austria helped the Catholic Church to progress in America by means of financial aid. Father Blied's work on this important subject brings to light many interesting facts about the American Catholics' financial background from the mid-1800's, facts which are passed over by general histories of America and Austria.

The book, however, is not so much for leisure reading as it is for reference work or sectional reading. Its many figures and minute details, together with the narrow scope of the subject, make it difficult to read right through. But chapters II, III and IV might well be introduced into any course on the history of

the Catholic Church in America, and the book will supply many statistics about the Church's growth in America.

JOHN G. HOLBROOK

The Risen Soldier, by Francis J. Spellman. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1944. pp. 39. \$1.00

In this terse booklet the archbishop brings a vivid, consoling message to the mothers and fathers of fighting men. Waiting on a North African airfield for a pilot who did not return, the archbishop experiences disgust, sorrow, and bewildering discouragement at man's destruction of man. Yet in Christ the Risen Soldier he finds hope. With this theme he clearly points out the path to final victory and lasting peace. Gold star fathers and mothers will find here the ideals for which their sons died. Everyone will find this book a stirring plea for peace based on the teachings of Christ.

THOMAS TERRY

The Vatican and the War, by Camille Cianfarra. New York. E. P. Dutton and Company. 1944. pp. 344. \$3.00

Like many books of our day, *The Vatican and the War* will not be classified as an enduring work. This does not detract from its obvious merits, however, and is but the inevitable consequence of the author's purpose. Cianfarra, well-known Rome correspondent of the *New York Times*, set out to give papal activity for peace and justice the publicity it deserves. Drawing on a rich fund of inside information from both Vatican and Italian state circles, he gives a clear portrait of the valiant, often pathetic, attempts of Pius XI and Pius XII to stave off the avalanche of September 1939. Along with these incidents he carefully points out the ever-increasing friction between the Vatican and the dictators.

This is an interesting and timely book. Its sources are mainly the personal uncoverings of the author, but they offer a convincing picture. It provides an excellent historical supplement for the papal writings of the past ten years.

DONALD CAMPION

BOOKS RECEIVED

Pioneer Jesuits in Northern Mexico, by Peter M. Dunne, S.J. U. of California Press. \$3.00

Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet, by Rembert W. Patrick. Louisiana State U. Press. \$3.75

The School Controversy (1891-1893), by Daniel F. Reilly, O.P. The Catholic U. Of America Press. \$3.00

The General Who Rebuilt the Jesuits, by Robert G. North, S.J. Bruce Publishing Company. \$3.00

Jules Ferry and the Renaissance of French Imperialism, by Thomas F. Power, Jr. King's Crown Press. \$2.75

Pitchfork Ben Tillman—South Carolinian, by Francis Butler Simkins. Louisiana State University Press. \$4.50

Local History, by Donald Dean Parker. The Social Science Research Council. \$1.00

Margaret Brent-Adventurer, by Dorothy Fremont Grant. Longmans, Green & Company. \$2.50

Men of Maryknoll, by James Keller and Meyer Berger. Grosset & Dunlap, Inc. \$1.00

Our Neighbors the Chinese, by F. D. Davis. Field Afar Press. \$.35

SOME TIMELY TOPICS

SINEWS OF PEACE

Bernard W. Dempsey (Vol. XIX No. 4)

THE NATIONALIST MENACE

Raymond Corrigan (Vol. XVIII No. 4)

JAPAN LOOKS BACK

RUSSIA AND THE VERSAILLES ORDER

IN BACK ISSUES
OF THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Back issues and Index copies \$.30

Don't miss

This Month's

Classical Bulletin

The Voice of Christian Humanism

21st year

Monthly, October to June

\$1.00 Yearly